17 5145
36
#328

# The Mennonite Quarterly Review

*Editor*
HAROLD S. BENDER, *Goshen College*

*Associate Editors*

GUY F. HERSHBERGER
Goshen College

JOHN UMBLE
Goshen College

EDWARD YODER
Scottdale, Pa.

ERNST CORRELL
Washington, D. C.

C. HENRY SMITH
Bluffton, Ohio

ABRAM WARKENTIN
Newton, Kansas

CHRISTIAN NEFF
Weierhof, Germany

BENJAMIN UNRUH
Karlsruhe, Germany

VOLUME XII

1938

Published by
Goshen College
Goshen, - Indiana

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

v.12
1938

Press of
THE MENNONITE PUBLISHING HOUSE
Scottdale, Pennsylvania

# THE Mennonite Quarterly Review

BOARD OF EDITORS
HAROLD S. BENDER, *Goshen College*, Editor
GUY F. HERSHBERGER, *Goshen College*
EDWARD YODER, *Goshen College*
CHRISTIAN NEFF, *Weierhof, Germany*
JOHN UMBLE, *Goshen College*
ERNST CORRELL, *American University*
BENJAMIN UNRUH, *Karlsruhe, Germany*

VOLUME XII JANUARY, 1938 NUMBER ONE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 2

THE PERSECUTION OF THE EVANGELICAL ANABAPTISTS 3
*John Horsch*

THE THEOLOGY OF CONRAD GREBEL, I. 27
*Harold S. Bender*

ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936-1937 55
*Silas Hertzler*

328955

# EDITORIAL

The Persecution of the Evangelical Anabaptists in Reformation Times is one of the dark sides of Reformation history. Catholics and Protestants, Lutherans and Reformed, all participated, unitedly and separately, in an intense campaign to exterminate the Anabaptist "heresy" root and branch. The campaign was fairly successful, so that the original Anabaptist movement was strangled in the very beginning of its history, except in Holland. However the steadfastness and non-resistant spirit of the Anabaptist martyrs had a powerful effect, both upon the masses of the people, and upon those who were directly charged with the execution. In an extensive account in this issue, John Horsch summarizes the persecution and gives abundant evidence of the powerful effect of the testimony of the martyrs. The article is particularly valuable for its quotations and citations from contemporary accounts. Here for the first time the story of the persecution of the Anabaptists is presented in a systematic fashion.

The Early Life of Conrad Grebel was Treated in a Series of Articles which appeared in the *Review* in Volume X, Numbers 1, 2, and 3, January, April, and July, 1936. The *Review* now presents two articles on the theology of Conrad Grebel, the first of which will appear in this issue. They are chapters from the biography of Conrad Grebel by Harold S. Bender which will be published in book form by the Mennonite Historical Society in the early part of the coming year. The source material for Grebel's theology is rather scanty, but it has been exhaustively exploited by the author. In addition to a summary of the teachings of Grebel, the articles will treat of the sources and the development of Grebel's theology. A description of the chief theological writings of Grebel is included. The discussion develops the thesis that Grebel's theology was derived primarily from two sources, namely Ulrich Zwingli and direct study of the Scriptures.

For the ninth time the Review presents Professor Silas Hertzler's statistical report on attendance in Mennonite schools and colleges, covering the academic year 1936-1937. The current report is the most comprehensive that has yet been published, particularly for the numerous local Mennonite high schools which are operated chiefly by the western Mennonite churches of German-Russian stock. However the difficulty in securing complete reports from all of these minor institutions has made it necessary to delay the publication of the whole report beyond the October issue in which it has usually appeared heretofore. It has therefore been decided to omit this category of Mennonite schools from the future reports. Hereafter the reports will be limited to colleges and high schools whose student body is drawn from a larger area than the local congregation. Perhaps some other writer will undertake to prepare annual reports summarizing the work of the local schools.

THE
Mennonite Quarterly
Review

VOLUME XII JANUARY, 1938 NUMBER ONE

# THE PERSECUTION OF THE EVANGELICAL ANABAPTISTS

JOHN HORSCH

The Anabaptist movement, it is worth noticing, originated in the face of threatening persecution. Conrad Grebel in a number of letters written in 1524, a few months before the organization of the first Anabaptist congregation was effected, stated that persecution unto death was sure to be the lot of himself and his associates if they continued in their dissent from the dominant state church party. In Zurich the number of those who were willing to take the consequences of deviating from the creed prescribed by the civil authorities was small at that time. Speaking of Zurich and vicinity, Grebel stated that there were not twenty persons who were fully decided to proceed along strictly Scriptural lines as concerned the reformation or renewal of the church. However, after the Brethren of Zurich and vicinity, in January, 1525, had organized themselves as a church, the movement spread rapidly, notwithstanding persecution, not only in the canton Zurich but in other cantons of Switzerland, as well as in South Germany.

The contemporary chronicler Sebastian Franck, a reliable historian but an opponent of the Anabaptists, wrote in 1531 (that is, about five years before Menno Simons' conversion):

> The Anabaptists spread so rapidly that their teaching soon covered, as it were, the land. They soon gained a large following,

> and baptized many thousands, drawing to themselves many sincere souls who had a zeal for God. For they taught nothing but love, faith, and the need of bearing the cross. They showed themselves humble, patient under much suffering; they brake the bread with one another as an evidence of unity and love. They helped each other faithfully, called each other brothers, etc. They increased so rapidly that the world feared an uprising by them, though I have learned that this fear had no justification whatsoever. They were persecuted with great tyranny, being imprisoned, branded, tortured and executed by fire, water, and the sword. In a few years very many were put to death. Some have estimated the number of those who were killed to be far above two thousand. They died as martyrs, patiently, and humbly endured all persecution.[1]

Professor Carl Adolf Cornelius, one of the profoundest students of Anabaptist history, says:

> The Anabaptist messengers of the Gospel came in humble appearance and unassuming attire, much like the apostles. They labored preferably among the poor and lowly. With a greeting of peace they entered the dwellings to read from the Word of God and deliver their message. Their language was simple and straightforward, with no pretense to scholarship. But the message-bearers were confessors and martyrs, and the warmth of their hearts impressed the hearers. Persecuted and fugitive, uncertain of the bare material necessities, their life bore a strong testimony to their words. Therefore, their message, in the full strength of its Biblical content, was edifying and soul-winning, moving, and convincing.[2]

Many Anabaptist traveling preachers labored in Switzerland, Alsace, South Germany, and Austria. The people of these countries were prepared for the message of the primitive Gospel. Great numbers of the people had become interested in religion as never before. Church reformation was in the air. Through the earlier reformatory writings of Luther, Zwingli, and others, many had been led to see some of the errors of Romanism in the light of Scripture. Furthermore, many had received sufficient light to recognize the compromising character of Protestant state churchism. The Protestant state churches failed to bring about a reformation as concerned Christian living and actual piety. Regarding this fact

1. Franck, S., *Chronica,* 1531, fol. 444b.
2. Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs,* II, p. 48.

there was, practically, only one opinion expressed by contemporary writers, be they Romanist, Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Anabaptist. They agreed in recognizing the fact that the state church type of the Reformation, under the leadership of Luther and Zwingli, had not resulted in a reformation of the life of the people.

The message of the leading reformers, as concerned their opposition to Romanism, was fully approved by the Anabaptists, but these reformers, in the opinion of the Anabaptists had failed to do a complete work in purging out the Romish leaven. The preaching of salvation by faith was acceptable to the evangelical Anabaptists, but they insisted that saving faith is necessarily coupled with repentance and definite personal conversion. They believed that the teaching and preaching of the leading reformers failed to comprise the whole of the Christian message, as laid down in the New Testament Scriptures. The Anabaptists held that a true reformation of the church will necessarily result in newness of life on the part of the constituency of the church, and in bringing forth the fruits of obedience and consistent Christian living in accordance with the teaching and demands of Scripture. The masses of the people who constituted the new state churches gave unmistakable indications of an increasing religious indifference and an unwillingness to bear persecution for the sake of the new creed which had been introduced by the state.

Anabaptist evangelists were, practically, the only missionaries of that time. And yet, the Reformation movement, as led by Luther and Zwingli, in its earlier stages had been largely of a missionary character. To a considerable extent the general Reformation movement was in the earlier periods propagated through missionary effort, and not a few evangelists, sometimes called "readers," labored as missionaries. But after Luther and Zwingli had approved of state churchism, it was considered the task of the civil rulers to introduce the Protestant creed in their respective countries or provinces, especially since it was soon found that the populations would discard Romanism and accept the new creed upon orders of the governments. Those civil authorities who took a favorable attitude toward the Reformation preferred to have the change of creed made upon their own initiative and orders, rather than through missionary effort. Moreover, as concerns mission work in territory ruled by strict Romanists, the leading reformers, who hoped to win

these rulers, were aware that Protestant mission work would antagonize them and minimize the chances of winning them for the Reformation. Therefore Protestant mission work in Catholic states was considered uncalled-for by Luther and Zwingli.

Luther in particular, after consenting to state churchism, expressed the opinion that only one creed should be permitted to be taught in each state or province, and that Lutheran preachers should abstain from preaching in Roman Catholic territory.[3] In 1532 Luther wrote a book, *Against the Sneaks and Hedgepreachers,* meaning the Anabaptist preachers and missionaries who labored in any territory without the permission of the civil authorities. He stated in this book that no minister of the true Gospel should preach in Roman Catholic territory without the knowledge and consent of the authorities. He referred to mission work which was carried on contrary to the will of the civil authorities as hedgepreaching. In consequence, after the first period of the Reformation movement, few if any missionaries representing the Protestant state churches were found in Roman Catholic territory.

The Anabaptists, on the other hand, endeavored to win the common people. Their evangelists had nothing to gain by shunning Catholic states for the sake of escaping persecution; they were persecuted in Lutheran and Zwinglian states as well. The Anabaptist missionary, Claus Felbinger, said:

Some have asked us why we came into the country of the duke of Bavaria. I answered, 'We go not only into this land but into all lands, as far as our language extends. For wherever God opens a door unto us, shows us zealous hearts who earnestly seek Him, who have an aversion to the ungodly life of the world, and desire to amend their lives, to all such places we aim to go, and for this we have Scriptural ground'."

As already indicated, the Anabaptists spread with surprising rapidity. Sometimes a church was founded within a few hours after the coming of an Anabaptist preacher. "Anabaptism spread with such speed," says a contemporary writer, "that there was reason to fear that the majority of the common people would unite with this sect."[3a] There is evidence that in certain provinces large portions of the population were openly sympathetic toward the Anabaptists.

3. *Luthers Werke*, Weimar, XXX, pp. 510-527.

3a. Roth, F., *Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte,* 1901, p. 230.

In inherent strength the Anabaptist movement easily surpassed the general Reformation movement in certain sections, such as the canton Berne in Switzerland and the Tyrol. Following is an authoritative description of conditions prevailing in the Tyrol which indicates the intensity of the movement in that Austrian province. This account shows the almost insurmountable difficulties confronting the persecuting authorities, in consequence of the decidedly friendly attitude of a large portion of the population toward the Anabaptists. This description is taken from an official report made by Tyrolean magistrates. It is dated October 17, 1539 and has the title: "Report concerning the reasons why the Anabaptists have become so numerous in this province, and why notwithstanding all possible diligence of some of the magistrates, they could not be suppressed." This document, of which the following is a part, shows how deeply the movement had taken root among the general population:

> The common people take an entirely favorable attitude toward the Anabaptists. They are kindly disposed toward them and take sides with them. Even such as are not of the Anabaptist sect and were not baptized by them give them lodging, food, and support. And although there are those who, because of fear of punishment or on account of abject poverty, abstain from rendering them such aid, they nevertheless permit the Anabaptists daily to walk to and fro among themselves at will. They do not report Anabaptists to the magistrates or government, and do nothing toward having them arrested.
>
> If the magistrates are informed of a place in mountainous parts or elsewhere where Anabaptists have their abode, or where they have a meeting; if any such information comes to the magistrates, and if they plan to make efforts, by the help and assistance of the population, to fall upon the Anabaptists suddenly, in order to seize and arrest them, and if the magistrates then order some of their subjects to proceed in all quietness with the officers of the law to such a place and to assist in surprising and arresting the Anabaptists; then if those who receive such orders cannot excuse themselves and cannot in some way persuade the officers to permit them to stay at home; even then those that accompany the officers to such places will not move a hand to assist in apprehending the Anabaptists.
>
> Even when any Anabaptists are close to the men sent to apprehend them and they could easily lay hands on them, they will let

> them run unhindered into the forests and mountains, and thus make their escape from the magistrates. They excuse themselves afterwards saying that they had not seen any or had not been able to outrun them. And sometimes those who have been ordered to assist in arresting the Anabaptists will warn them of the coming of the officers. Again, although the citizens, especially in the summer season, may not permit the Anabaptists to enter their homes [since houses in which they had been given lodging were to be burned to the ground], they will permit them to stay close by their houses on their grounds or in near-by forests and mountains, where they let them build booths and huts, and permit them to move about at will. They do not report to the magistrates any Anabaptists, much less do they give information about places where they abide, or have their meetings, but they, on the contrary, will give them aid and advice to enable them to escape. Food and all necessities of life are brought to them at day and night. All this is contrary to the mandates, orders, and prohibitions issued by the government.[4]

So far the report of Tyrolean government officials. The last sentence referring to the leniency of some of the judges and jurors deserves especial notice.

In a royal decree dated April 22, 1543, and addressed to certain Tyrolean magistrates, the noteworthy complaint is made that the judges over the Anabaptists "decide the cases according to their own consciences, and not in accordance with the edicts"[5] — a striking proof that the judges had conscientious scruples against sentencing Anabaptists to death.

In another mandate it is demanded that the judges and jurors, before beginning an Anabaptist trial, must swear a solemn oath to God and the saints that they will pronounce sentence as prescribed by the mandates. King Ferdinand of Austria himself, who had insisted on the utmost stringency, declared in 1543 that he was "terrified" by the many executions.[6] The judges and jurors became progressively more reluctant to pronounce the death sentence over Anabaptists. The mandates demanded that the officials do all in their power to prevent the escape of any Anabaptists to Moravia, where they were tolerated, for many magistrates favored their flight.

4. Loserth, J., *Der Anabaptismus in Tirol,* Wien, 1892, II, pp. 131-133.
5. The same work, II, p. 58.
6. The same work, II, p. 56.

The strength of the Anabaptist movement in the Tyrol, as above described, was paralleled in other states, notably in the canton Berne in Switzerland (concerning which more anon) and in parts of the canton Basel. In a number of states it was found difficult to carry out the "bloody decrees" against the dissenters. We shall directly see that the Reichstag, the House of Representatives of Germany, being the highest legislative and executive authority of the empire, in 1551 passed a decree ordering the removal from office and punishment of judges who had scruples against sentencing Anabaptists to death. To avoid giving offence to the people in general, Anabaptists were often executed secretly. Clearly in these sections the Anabaptist movement, if tolerated by the authorities, would have completely upset the plans for a state-governed church in which the whole population would hold membership by force of civil law.

It need scarcely be said that Romanism had always taken an attitude of intolerance and persecution toward all other non-Romanist Christian professors. The principal leaders in the general reformation movement, Luther and Zwingli, in the first period of their reformatory labors, condemned the Romish intolerance. They were defenders of the principle of liberty of conscience. Later they agreed to a thorough-going union of the church with the state, which meant a state-controlled church and the abandonment of the principle of religious liberty. The natural and inevitable consequence of such a union was the persecution of the dissenters by the established Protestant state churches.

It is a fact recognized by various historians that the persecution of the Anabaptists surpassed in severity the persecution of the early Christians by pagan Rome. Persecution began in Zurich soon after the Brethren had organized a congregation. Imprisonment of varying severity, sometimes in dark dungeons, was followed by executions. Felix Manz was the first martyr to die in Zurich, but at least two Brethren had been martyred earlier in other cantons of Switzerland by Roman Catholic governments. Within a short period the leaders of the Brethren lost their lives in the persecution. Among the early leaders of the evangelical Anabaptists that suffered martyrdom were Eberli Bolt, Johannes Krüsi, Hans Lüdi, Michael Sattler, Hans Brötli, Thomas Herman, Eitelhans Langenmantel, Leonhard Schiemer, Hans Schlaffer, Hans Leopold Schnei-

der, Wolfgang Uliman, Wolfgang Brandhuber, Georg Zaunring, Jerome Käls, Leonhard Seiler, Jacob Hutter, Offrus Griesinger, Georg Blaurock.

Anabaptism was made a capital crime. Prizes were set on the heads of Anabaptists. To give them food and shelter was made a crime. In Roman Catholic states even those who recanted were often executed. Generally, however, those who abjured their faith were pardoned, except in Bavaria and, for a time in Austria, and also in the Netherlands. The duke of Bavaria, in 1527, gave orders that the imprisoned Anabaptists should be burned at the stake, unless they recanted, in which case they should be beheaded. King Ferdinand I of Austria issued a number of severe decrees against them, the first general mandate being dated August 28, 1527. In Catholic countries the Anabaptists, as a rule, were executed by burning at the stake, in Lutheran and Zwinglian states generally by beheading or drowning.

Emperor Charles V. of Germany issued a general mandate against the Anabaptists on January 4, 1528, which was read from the pulpits of all cities, towns and villages, decreeing that not only those who had received baptism but all parents who would not have their children baptized in good time were guilty of a criminal offense deserving death. Within a few years a number of imperial decrees followed. Not only were the Anabaptists to be executed by fire, but their dwellings also should be burned, unless they were located in towns or cities, in which case they should be razed to the ground. In certain provinces their houses were confiscated. Speaking of Northern Germany, Menno Simons relates that in 1546 a small house of four rooms was confiscated by the authorities because the owner had rented it to Menno and his family. In Tyrol even the houses in which an Anabaptist had been given temporary lodging were to be destroyed.

Thousands sealed their faith with their blood. When all efforts to halt the movement proved vain, the authorities resorted to desperate measures. Armed executioners and mounted soldiers were sent in companies through the land to hunt down the Anabaptists and kill them on the spot without trial or sentence. The old method of pronouncing sentence over each individual dissenter proved inadequate to exterminate this faith.

In the first week of Lent, 1528, while Hubmaier was imprisoned at Castle Greizenstein, King Ferdinand of Austria commissioned a

detachment of executioners to root out the Anabaptist faith in his territory. Those who were overtaken in the highways or fields were killed with the sword, others were dragged out of their houses and hanged on the door posts. Most of them had gone into hiding in the woods and mountains. In a forest near Lengbach seventeen were put to death.

In 1528, in the province of Swabia, in South Germany, four hundred mounted soldiers were sent out to put to death all Anabaptists on whom they could lay hands. Somewhat later the number of soldiers so commissioned was increased to eight hundred and then to one thousand. In various provinces an imperial provost marshal by the name of Berthold Aichele, with his assistants, put many Anabaptists to death. On Christmas day, 1531, he drove seventeen men and women into a farmhouse near Aalen in Württemberg and burned the building together with the inmates. Three hundred and fifty Anabaptists were executed in the Palatinate before the year 1530. The Count of Alzey, in that province, after having put many to death, was heard to exclaim: "What shall I do? The more I kill, the greater becomes their number." At Ensisheim, "the slaughterhouse of Alsace," as it was called, six hundred were killed within a few years. Within six weeks thirty-seven were burned, drowned, or beheaded at Linz, in Austria. In the town of Kitzbüchl in the Tyrol, sixty-eight were executed in one year. Two hundred and ten or more were burned in the valley of the Inn River. The number of Anabaptist martyrs in the Tyrol and Görz was estimated at one thousand about the end of the year 1531.

It was comparatively easy for the catch-polls to ascertain who was and who was not an Anabaptist. They simply put the question to suspected persons. A true Anabaptist would disdain saving his life and burdening his conscience by telling an untruth and denying his faith.

In April of the year 1529 the national legislative assembly (Reichstag) of the German Empire, in session at Speier in the Palatinate, passed an edict demanding that "every Anabaptist and re-baptized person of either sex shall be put to death by fire, sword, or in some other way." Thus the sentence of death was summarily passed by imperial law upon all Anabaptists. "Those in authority," says Menno Simons, "do not consider why one has begun a new life and has received the baptism of Christ. They only ask whether he is baptized. If the answer is in the affirmative, the sentence is al-

ready pronounced and he must die." It was expressly stated in the edict of Speier that any parents who failed to have their infant children baptized, were to be considered Anabaptists and punished as such. Only those who recanted instantly could, according to this edict, be pardoned. The cruelty of this persecution caused grievous offence even within the Protestant state churches, whose representatives at Speier, with the exception of the Landgrave of Hesse, had consented to the adoption and publication of the edict. This persecution was all the more offensive, since with the recognition of the Protestant state churches, the religious unity of the empire was broken. Again, it should be recalled that this was in the earliest period of Anabaptist history, a number of years previous to the rise of the fanatical, revolutionary Anabaptists. It is therefore impossible to make revolutionary Anabaptism responsible for the persecution of the evangelical Anabaptists, as some have done.

Two years after the Reichstag of Speier of 1529, the representatives of the German empire, assembled at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, in a new edict against the Anabaptists, partly admitted that the law to put to death all Anabaptists was passed somewhat hastily. And yet, so it was further stated, these people were not punished for their faith but for transgressing the imperial laws against a second baptism. Hence the severity of the edict of 1529 was not mitigated. In subsequent sessions of the Reichstag also the carrying out of this edict was insisted upon. The clause was added, in 1544, that those of the clergy who are tardy in their duty of denouncing Anabaptism from the pulpits "should be duly punished." Since it had been learned that in certain sections some of the judges had indicated conscientious scruples against pronouncing the death sentence upon any one on account of matters of faith, the Reichstag of 1551, assembled at Augsburg, passed a decree ordering that judges and jurors who had such scruples should be removed from office and punished by heavy fines and imprisonment.

It is particularly noteworthy that these edicts and mandates were passed with the consent of the Protestant members of the Reichstag. At Speier, in 1529, the Protestant members had protested against a proposed curtailment of the rights claimed by the Lutheran princes. Indeed it was for this reason that the name "Protestants" was given to them. But both here and in subsequent sessions of the Reichstag the Protestants failed to protest against the tyrannical edicts passed against the Anabaptists.

In Saxony and other Protestant states Anabaptists who refused to recant were put to death. In one extraordinary case an Anabaptist—his name was Frederick Erbe—was imprisoned for life in Saxony. His execution was prevented by peculiar circumstances. In 1531 he was seized and arrested in the county of Hausbreitenbach. This county was not an integral part of Saxony but was under the joint jurisdiction of Saxony and Hesse. A sentence of capital punishment could be pronounced only with the consent of the rulers of both provinces. The Elector of Saxony insisted on passing the death sentence on Frederick Erbe, while Landgrave Philip of Hesse persistently withheld his consent to so cruel punishment. The landgrave had grave scruples against capital punishment on account of matters of faith; he did not approve of severer measures against the Anabaptists than imprisonment and banishment. The Elector of Saxony, on the contrary, had scruples of conscience against dealing so leniently with the Anabaptists, as the ruler of Hesse proposed. In letters to Landgrave Philip, the Elector of Saxony pointed out repeatedly that the edict of Speier demanded the greatest severity, and that the edict had been ratified in successive sessions of the Reichstag.

In consequence, Frederick Erbe, after having been subjected to torture by Saxon magistrates, was kept in prison for seventeen years, namely, until his death in 1549. His first prison was a remote tower in the city wall of Eisenach. Here he found it possible, through a window, to converse with and admonish his brethren, some of whom gathered here at times in the quiet of the night. Two of them were seized here by officers of the law and executed, in November, 1535. Frederick Erbe was then incarcerated in the dungeon of the rear tower of Wartburg castle, the castle in which Luther, less than a score of years before, had translated the New Testament Scriptures. However, while Luther had gone to the Wartburg for protection, Frederick Erbe was thrown into a dungeon of the castle for the reason that he could not approve of some of the teachings which Luther and the Saxon state church had meanwhile accepted. Erbe constantly refused to buy his release from prison by the repudiation of his convictions. After his death the warden of the prison gave him the testimony that he had lived a good life and had always been obedient.[7]

7. Wappler, P., *Die Stellung Kursachens und des Landgrafen Philip von Hessen zur Täuferbewegung,* 1910, p. 93.

In the province of Moravia, in modern Czechoslovakia, the first great persecution of the Anabaptists (mostly Hutterian Brethren) took place in 1535. Many suffered martyrdom. This was followed by a period of tranquillity, but in 1548 a severe persecution set in which continued for over four years. Many of the Moravian nobility personally took a friendly attitude toward the Brethren but were forced by the central government to drive them from their dwellings. During much of these four years the Brethren were compelled to live in cliffs, caverns and caves. From 1553 to near the end of that century they again enjoyed a time of toleration and peace under the protection of the nobles who derived great benefit from the industries in their colonies. In the first years of the Thirty Years War a cruel persecution came upon them. Their numerous colonies were totally destroyed and the inhabitants all were driven from the country in the cold season of the year and forbidden to return on penalty of death (1622). They fled to Hungary where those who survived the terrible hardships organized themselves into a number of colonies.

The severest storms of persecution, as described above, befell the evangelical Anabaptists in South Germany before the rise of the Mennonite Church in the Netherlands. Nevertheless the number of Mennonite martyrs in the Netherlands is likewise very large. Here also, as in Switzerland and South Germany, the brotherhood grew and expanded under severe persecution. The number of Mennonite martyrs in the Netherlands is estimated at about 1,500.

Large numbers of Mennonites were put to death in Friesland and other northern provinces of the Netherlands, yet the persecution was more severe in the southern provinces, particularly in Flanders and Brabant (modern Belgium). In both the northern and southern provinces new "blood-decrees" (as they were sometimes called) were from time to time published, ordering the severest persecution of the Anabaptists. These decrees were heeded and carried out more stringently in the southern than in the northern provinces. Within a few decades the worst storms of persecution had subsided in the North, while in Flanders and Brabant the persecution continued unabated. The Mennonites in the provinces just named, who escaped the sword of the executioner, fled into the northern provinces, what is now modern Holland.

At no other place in the Netherlands were so large numbers of Mennonite confessors executed as in Antwerp, "that den of mur-

derers," as this city is referred to in one of the martyrs' hymns. The Mennonite church in this city was very strong, its membership being estimated at one time at about two thousand. Those who could be apprehended were imprisoned in the dungeons of the castle called *Het Steen*. This castle is located on an elevation close to the Scheldt river. The dungeons under the castle consist of about a dozen low rooms, four by seven to sixteen by sixteen feet in size. The light of day does not reach this dreary place and there is, with two exceptions, no opening whatever for ventilation, except in the doors leading from one compartment into another. At the foot of the stairway to the dungeons there is a large flat stone covering the opening of a channel about three feet in diameter down into the Scheldt river. A martyr's hymn makes mention of three Mennonite women who, in 1557, were imprisoned in *"Het Steen,"* and whose bodies, identified by their clothing, were seen floating down the river toward the sea.

Mennonite prisoners in Antwerp and other cities of Flanders were treated with the utmost severity. A number of them, in letters written from their prisons, said that telling an untruth would have secured their release. This means that they could have denied that they were ever baptized upon the confession of their faith. They had admitted that they were baptized and were therefore obviously sure of being condemned to death. Recantation would not have prevented their execution. Gillis of Aachen, a Mennonite prisoner at Antwerp, formerly a bishop, was sentenced to death by fire. He weakened and recanted his faith. In consequence the sentence was commuted from death by fire to beheading. He was executed on July 10, 1557.

There are a number of cases on record of magistrates who had received orders to arrest certain persons accused of Anabaptism, and warned them of the danger before attempting to carry out such orders. Hans de Ries, who later became the most influential leader of the Waterlandian Mennonites, succeeded in making his escape from Antwerp but was arrested in a small town in his flight to the north. He was released after addressing the magistrates of the town in this manner: "Know ye, my lords, that we have not fled because we refuse to give our lives for the name of Jesus, for long ago we have surrendered our lives to God; but we fled because we would not give our persecutors any occasion for sinning against us. But if it must be so, if shedding of blood alone will satisfy you,

well, here we are; do with us that which you may consider good in your consciences. As for us, we are not afraid to meet death."

Menno Simons wrote concerning the persecution in the Netherlands:

> Those who fear God must bear great persecution, as we witness with our eyes. How many pious children of God have the magistrates within a few years deprived of their homes and possessions, confiscated their property, and committed it to the bottomless imperial money chests; how many have they driven out of cities and countries and put to the stocks and torture, turning the poor orphans destitute into the streets. Some they have executed by hanging, some they have tortured with inhuman tyranny and afterwards choked with cords on the stake. Some they roasted and burned alive. Some they have killed with the sword and given them to the fowls of the air to devour. Some they have cast to the fishes. Some had their houses destroyed. Some had their feet cut off, one of whom I have seen and conversed with. Others wander about here and there, in want, homelessness and affliction, in mountains and deserts, in holes and caves of the earth, as Paul says. They must flee with their wives and little children from one country to another, from one city to another. They are hated, abused, slandered and lied about by all men.[8]

Again in Brabant, Flanders, Friesland and Gelders the God-fearing, pious people are daily innocently led to the slaughter and inhumanly martyrized with great, grievous tyranny, says Menno. (Marginal note: "A true, consecrated Christian is an unconquerable knight; yea he is stronger than emperor or king.")[9]

Following is a description of the persecution of the evangelical Anabaptists (the Swiss Brethren, Mennonites and Hutterites) in various countries, as given by one of the old chroniclers. After recording the death of 2,173 brethren and sisters who gave their lives for the sake of the faith, the chronicler continues:[10]

> These all were executed with all sorts of torture and manner of death, a new cloud of witnesses which surrounds us, a pillar of fire by night to go before us, confessors of the faith and Christian heroes of the truth of God, men and women, youths and maidens, old and young, ministers and others, by which we see that God has poured out His grace and power in these latter days as well as in the former time.

8. *Menno Simons' Complete Works,* I, p. 196a.
9. The same work, II, p. 11.
10. Horsch, J., *The Hutterian Brethren,* p. 39.

Some were tortured terribly on the rack so that they were torn apart and died.

Some were burned to ashes and powder as heretics.

Some were roasted on beams, some torn with red-hot irons.

Some were penned up in houses and all burned together.

Some were hung on trees, others executed with the sword, and chopped to pieces.

Many had gags put in their mouths and their tongues tied so that they could not speak and testify to their faith, and were thus led to the stake.

What they had confessed with the mouth they testified with their blood.

Like lambs they were led to the slaughter and murdered according to the devil's desire and will, who is a murderer from the beginning.

One group of women were cast into the water and then taken out again and asked whether they would recant. Seeing that they were steadfast, their executioners cast them again into the water and drowned them. So terribly Satan raged through his children. (The chronicler adds the marginal note: "One need not go across the seas to find heathenism").

Some were starved to death in dark towers where they were deprived of the light of day.

Some were cast into deep, noisome dungeons, to die, where they lay among bats and vermin.

Many were tortured with hunger.

Some, who were adjudged too young to be slain, were bound and beaten miserably with rods.

Many were promised great gifts and riches should they recant. Others were entreated to utter just a single swear word, even a slight profanity, and they would be released.

Many were talked to in wonderful ways, often day and night. They were argued with, with great cunning and cleverness, with many sweet and smooth words, by monks and priests, by doctors of theology, with much false testimony, with threats and scolding and mockery, yea, with lies and grievous slanders against the Brotherhood, but none of these things moved them or made them falter.

Some sang praises to God while they lay in grievous imprisonment, as though they were in great joy. Some did the same as they were being led to the place of execution and death, singing joyfully with uplifted voice that it rang out loud. Others stepped to the place of death with a smile on their lips, praising God that they were accounted worthy to die the death of the Christian hero, and would not have preferred even to die a natural death.

No human being was able to take away out of their hearts what they had experienced, such zealous lovers of God were they. The fire of God burned within them. They would die the bitterest death, yea they would die ten deaths rather than to forsake the divine truth which they had espoused.

They had drunk of the water which is flowing from God's

sanctuary, yea of the water of life. They realized that God helped them to bear the cross and to overcome the bitterness of death. The fire of God burned within them. Their tent they had pitched not here upon earth, but in eternity, and of their faith they had a foundation and assurance. Their faith blossomed like a lily, their loyalty as a rose, their piety and candor as the flower of the garden of God. The angel of the Lord battled for them that they could not be deprived of the helmet of salvation. Therefore they bore all torture and agony without fear. The things of this world they counted in their holy mind only as shadows, having the assurance of greater things. They were thus drawn unto God that they knew nothing, sought nothing, desired nothing, loved nothing but God alone. Therefore they had more patience in their suffering than their enemies in tormenting them.

From the shedding of such innocent blood arose Christians everywhere, brothers all, for all this persecution did not take place without fruit. Many were moved thereby to give thought to these things, and to order their thinking, and doing and living in the light of the future, so many indeed that finally the authorities in many places would no longer execute the martyrs publicly, as for instance in the Tyrol, but condemned and slew them secretly by night so that the people could not know of it.

In some places they literally filled the prisons and dungeons with them, as did the Count Palatine. The persecutors thought they could dampen and extinguish the fire of God. But the prisoners sang in their prisons and rejoiced so that the enemies outside became much more fearful than the prisoners and did not know what to do with them. Many others lay for years in dungeons and prisons and endured all sorts of pain and torture. Others had holes burned through their cheeks and were then let free.

The rest, who escaped all this, were driven from one land to another, from one town to the next. They had to be like owls and bitterns which dare not be seen by daylight. Often they had to hide away in rocks and cliffs, in wild forests, in caves and holes in the earth to save their lives. They were sought by catchpolls and dogs, and were hunted down like birds. All were without guilt, without the least wicked deed, since they neither did nor desired to do any one the least harm or injury.

Everywhere they were cursed and slandered and lied about scandalously. It was said of them that they could bring people under their control by giving them to drink from a little flask. Scandalous lies were told about them, such as having their women in common. They were slandered devilishly as Anabaptists, seducers, rioters, fanatics. Everywhere were issued imperial, royal and princely mandates, decrees, and commands against them, commanding that they should nowhere be suffered or tolerated, nor even sheltered, but should be stamped out and annihilated.

Leonhard Schiemer, an Anabaptist minister who suffered martyrdom on January 14, 1528, at Rattenberg in the Tyrol, describes conditions as follows:

Thine holy place they have destroyed,
Thine altar overthrown,
And reaching forth their bloody hands,
Have foully slain Thine own.
And we alone, a little flock,
The few who still remain,
Are exiles wandering through the land
In sorrow and in shame.

We are, alas, like scattered sheep,
The shepherd not in sight,
Each far away from home and hearth,
And, like the birds of night
That hide away; in rocky clefts,
We have our rocky hold,
Yet, near at hand, as for the birds,
There waits the hunter bold.

We wander in the forests dark,
With dogs upon our track;
And, like the captive silent lamb,
Men bring us, prisoners, back.
They point to us amid the throng,
And with their taunts offend;
And long to let the sharpened ax
On heretics descend.

The most heroic examples of primitive Christian martyrdom were paralleled in the persecution of the evangelical Anabaptists. Their courage, fortitude and patience were admired even by many of their antagonists. A contemporary Catholic writer said concerning the way in which the Anabaptist martyrs met their death: "Such valiant dying has never been witnessed before, nor heard of except in the legends of the saints." The masses were impressed with the fact that these people were in great earnest in living up to the light they had received.

When Michael Hassel, after much suffering, died in the prison of Hohenwittling in Württemberg, the warden said: "If this man did not get to heaven, I shall despair of the courage even to knock at heaven's gate." The hangman of Burghausen, having beheaded three Anabaptists, exclaimed: "I should rather have executed seven thieves than these men. God have mercy!" In 1549 a Mennonite martyr at Leeuwarden in Friesland was burned at the stake. Many people witnessing the execution exclaimed: "This was a good man; if he is not a Christian, there is no Christian in the whole world." At Rotterdam in Holland, in 1558, three Mennonite men were to

be burned at the stake. The executioner, who seems to have been intoxicated, caused great suffering to the first of the three, whereupon the people who witnessed the scene, drove him away and liberated the three prisoners.

Berthold Aichele, the imperial provost marshal already mentioned, who put to death a great number of Anabaptists, finally became greatly troubled and stricken in conscience because of these executions. While undertaking the execution of Offrus Griesinger, at Brixen in the Tyrol, by burning at the stake, Aichele was filled with terror and dismay. He consequently lifted up his hand to heaven and swore a solemn oath, never again to put to death an Anabaptist, and he kept this vow. In many instances the executioners expressed their regret for being obliged to put them to death. Often they begged their victims to recant and save their lives. Instead of following this advice, the martyrs praised God on the scaffold or stake for giving them grace to stand by His truth even to the end. They died as Christian heroes in the triumph of the faith.

The severity of the persecution is to be partly explained from the fact, mentioned in the above quotation from Sebastian Franck, that the world feared that Anabaptism would result in political disturbances and revolution. While the populations in general permitted the civil authorities to rule over their consciences, the Anabaptists refused to accept a creed simply because it was prescribed by the authorities. Indeed, as noted before, they had espoused their faith contrary to the orders of the magistrates. This was interpreted as willful disobedience to the government.

The authorities were probably aware that the Anabaptists defended the principle of nonresistance. Nevertheless, the opinion generally prevailed among their opponents that their teaching on this point was a mere cloak for revolutionary aims. In a later period there were revolutionary Anabaptists, such as the Münsterites, who did not teach the principle of nonresistance. And after the Mennonites in Switzerland had for two centuries not only taught but exemplified the principle of nonresistance, and their antagonists had long ceased to accuse them of revolutionary aims, the persecution none-the-less continued.

The most important source for the study of the martyrs is the great work compiled in 1660 by Thieleman Janz van Braght, a Mennonite minister of Dortrecht, Holland. The earliest predecessor of this work, entitled *Het Offer des Heeren* (the Offering of

the Lord) was printed for the first time in 1561 and appeared in at least eleven editions before the year 1600. It is the martyrology of the Dutch and Flemish Mennonite martyrs, and contains also many letters written by some of them from prisons, and their hymns, as well as poems describing their martyrdom. Van Braght, in the work mentioned above, undertook a more comprehensive martyrological collection, aiming to record the story of the martyrs of the evangelical Anabaptists of all countries to the extent of the information obtainable.

The title of this work, *Martyrs' Mirror,* is aptly chosen. The book reflects clearly the inner life, the spirit, and the motives of the martyrs. There are, in the first place, the accounts of their martyrdom and the preceding imprisonments, often in noisome dungeons, and the description of the cruel tortures to which they were subjected, all of which they bore in Christian patience and fortitude. Of equal importance and value are their confessions and their numerous letters written in the prisons which are contained in this work and which present a mirror of the inner life of the martyrs. These letters breathe the spirit of deepest piety and consecration, of immovable conviction and glowing certainty, of ardent love to God and the brotherhood. They express the willingness to bear the cross, to suffer and if need be to die for the faith.

The question is here pertinent, What was, in the last analysis, the motivation of the martyrs' determination to hold fast to the evangelical truth at any cost, and to give their lives for it if need be? One might say that they died for the sake of loyalty toward various doctrines, principles and commandments, and this is indeed correct. And yet, this does not express the whole truth. The fundamental reason why they held fast unto death to the divine truth, as they had learned it from the Word of God, was: They were convinced that a denial would be disloyalty to Christ. Their faithfulness and constancy were rooted and grounded in their faith in Christ and their love toward Him.

The fact deserves notice that evidently there was no unhealthy desire for martyrdom. True, a number of the martyrs expressed themselves in a way which might seem to indicate an unjustifiable desire of this sort. For instance, Adrian Pan wrote that he never had a happier day in a dungeon of *Het Steen* prison at Antwerp than the day when he was sentenced to death,[11] and Julius Bernarts

11. Van Braght, T. J., *Martyrs Mirror,* 1886, p. 596a.

said: "When the sentence of death was pronounced over me, my joy was full, since my redemption was so near.[12] Others also have expressed themselves in a similar way.[13] But such utterances must be considered in the light of the plain fact that there was absolutely no hope for liberation from their inhuman imprisonment during which they were, as a rule, at intervals subjected to cruel torture. To be apprehended and imprisoned meant certain death for them and it was only natural that they did not desire their time of great suffering to be prolonged.

Nevertheless, they were resigned to the will of the Lord. "My dear friends, thus I am still minded, and I so love my Lord and my God that, if I could save my life by thinking a thought, and I knew that it would not please the Lord, I would rather die than to think such a thought."[14] An evidence of the absence of an unsound desire for martyrdom is also found in the fact that they were possessed of an ardent love for their kin. Of this there is abundant proof in their letters. In the letters written in the prisons husbands often take a touching farewell from their wives, and wives from their husbands, or fathers and mothers from their children. "Kiss my little Susanneken (pet name of Susanna) for me," Hendrik Verstralen wrote twice in a letter to his wife.[15] Jerome Segers in his prison at Antwerp, having heard of the great grief of his wife because of his imprisonment, wrote to her, after reminding her of their future reunion before the Lord: "O that I might be able by my suffering to relieve your anxiety, I should gladly suffer death for you.[16] "We leave our dear little children," wrote a woman in prison, "whom I would not forsake for all the treasures of the world; could we do this, if we were not sure of our ground?"[17]

The martyrs looked constantly to God for His presence and help, having the firm conviction that nothing could befall them without His permission. "They cannot hurt a hair of our head without the will of our Father," wrote William Droogscherder from his prison.[18] Another wrote: "My dear friends, the more tribulation there is to try us, the more we are comforted through

12. The same work, p. 605b.
13. The same work, pp. 467b, 651b; *Het Offer des Heeren,* 1904, p. 528.
14. *Martyrs Mirror,* p. 591b.
15. *Het Offer des Heeren,* pp. 630, 633.
16. *Martyrs Mirror,* p. 495.
17. *Het Offer des Heeren,* p. 330.
18. *Martyrs Mirror,* p. 547a.

Christ; this we have abundantly experienced."[19] They experienced the presence and definite assistance and comfort of the Lord. "If we would think of the sufferings," wrote Jan Claesson, "we would not overcome, but we must look beyond these things upon the eternal reward."

A girl named Elizabeth, who suffered martyrdom in 1549 at Leeuwarden, said under torture: "Oh I cannot endure it any longer." The tormentors said: "Confess and we will relieve your pain." But she cried unto the Lord, her God: "Help me, O Lord, thy poor handmaiden! for thou art a helper in time of need." She continued to call on the Lord, and He took away her pain, so that she said to her tormentors: "I feel no longer any pain in my flesh as I did before." They obtained not a word from her in the way of betraying her brethren.[20] One of the martyrs, a girl at Basel in Switzerland, said under torture: "My body is in your power, you may brand, tear, and lacerate it as you may choose. But my soul overflows with joy through the inward consolation with which the Lord fills me."[21]

Invariably, when the martyrs were taken to the torture chamber to be laid on the rack, their greatest anxiety was that they, in order to have the excruciating pain alleviated, might yield to the demand to betray their brethren. Therefore they sometimes expressed the desire that they might know less about their brethren and their whereabouts. Many of their letters from the prisons contain warnings against too great inquisitiveness as concerned the names and dwelling places of those of like faith.

The records contain many testimonies that under the most severe tortures no name came over their lips.[22] They testified that the Lord kept their mouths sealed, while the inquisitors did all in their power "to drive out the dumb devil," as they said.

Jerome Segers gave the following touching account of his torture: "They tortured me severely, but the Lord was stronger than all their torments; He kept my lips. Eternal praise and glory be to Him who does not forsake His own. They obtained no names from me . . . . They threatened that they would torment me till the next morning and stretch me a foot longer than I was. Pouring water into my mouth they filled my body full of water. They

19. The same work, p. 595a.
20. The same work, p. 465a.
21. *Het Offer des Heeren,* pp. 167, 203, 208, 412.
22. *Martyrs Mirror,* p. 500.

had bound me with four ropes and racked me so that it seemed to me as though my head and legs were severed from the body. But they obtained nothing from me; praise and glory be to the Lord."

In passing, we may notice that there were among the martyrs evidently only very few who were not able to write. Illiterates were seldom found in Mennonite circles. The ability to read and study God's Word was under ordinary conditions considered essential for a successful Christian life. Illiterate converts were speedily taught to read. The friar Cornelis, a notorious inquisitor, at Bruges in Flanders, in a disputation with Jacob Keersgieter, said that those who formerly could not tell an A from a B, suddenly could read and write after they had been rebaptized. It was evident, he said, that the devil had a hand in this. "I can well hear," said Keersgieter in reply to this accusation, "that you do not understand our way of doing, you ascribe to the devil the grace which God grants our converts, when we with all diligence teach them to read.[23] A number of the letters of the martyrs refer to this fact that illiterate converts were taught to read. For the prisoners it was very difficult to obtain the light, paper and ink needed for writing (pencils being unknown in that age). One of these letters was written with a little juice of "krakeberries."

Within a few decades there was in various places and districts a noticeable relaxation in the persecution. Though the central governments of the states and provinces, as a rule, still insisted on enforcing and carrying out the edicts against the Anabaptists, some of the minor authorities, such as the magistrates of certain cities in Holland and Northern Germany, began to take a more lenient attitude toward the Mennonites. They had in a measure become acquainted with them and had been led to recognize the uncalled-for cruelty and unreasonableness of the persecution. While such magistrates would not have permitted the Mennonite people to hold public meetings, they were willing to overlook and ignore their presence, so long as they could do so without incurring danger to themselves.

This is evident from various facts and from a number of statements found in Menno Simons' writings. At the time when the last execution of a Mennonite martyr in Holland took place (1574) there were large Mennonite congregations in that country. A few years before this martyrdom occurred, the church at Harlingen

23. The same work, p. 742.

had 1,700, that at Franeker 1,300 members. Apparently they were left almost entirely undisturbed.

Menno Simons wrote concerning the tolerant attitude of some of the rulers and magistrates:

> In short, dear reader, if the merciful Lord had not, in His great love, tempered the hearts of some of the rulers and magistrates, but had let them proceed according to the instigations and blood-preaching of their theologians, no pious person would survive. But yet a few are found who, notwithstanding the words and writings of all theologians, tolerate the fugitives and at times show them mercy, for which we will forever give praise to God, the Most High, and also return our thanks in all love to such kind and discreet rulers.[24]

The first country to grant the Mennonites toleration was Holland. The last martyr in that country was Reitse Ayses who was burned at the stake in the city of Leeuwarden in Friesland, in 1574. At the time when Prince William of Orange came into power the Mennonites had become numerous in Holland. He was a prudent, tolerant ruler who clearly saw the unreasonableness of persecuting the Mennonites. Even some of their antagonists did not deny that they were useful citizens. The very presence of the numerous Mennonites was an unanswerable argument for the refutation of the theory that a state tolerating various religious creeds could not prosper.

The writer of the Preface to the Martyrs' Mirror of 1631, Hans de Ries, before his flight from Antwerp to the Northern Netherlands in 1577, had lived in the midst of the raging persecution which this work describes. By a hair's breadth, as it were, he had made his escape from that "den of murderers," Antwerp. His preface to his Book of Martyrs is in part as follows:

> You see here as in a mirror that neither the innate love between husband and wife, nor parental affection for their children, nor bonds of intimate friendship, nor the desire for life and the natural shrinking back from death could shake the steadfastness of these heroes, nor cause them to lose courage. Comparing these things with the "riches of Christ," they despised all such considerations and were willing to part from wife, children and friends, home and possessions; they were resigned to endure grievous imprisonment in dungeons, to suffer all kinds of hardship and privation, cruel torment and torture. Neither the threat-

24. *Menno Simons' Complete Works,* II, p. 104b.

enings of the most terrible death, nor the most alluring promises, (if they recanted) could move them to forsake the evangelical truth, the love of God and the blessed hope. With Paul they could say, "Who will separate us from the love of God?"

Through this love they overcame all and, above human strength, did glorious deeds of valor. In face of gallows and wheel, fire and sword they fearlessly confessed the truth, so that the judges and inquisitors at times marveled and at times were angered and even terrified. Calmly, yea with joy in their hearts, they endured that from which human beings naturally shrink. They were endued with such power that the most terrible and inhuman torments could not compel them to betray their brethren by mentioning their names. For the sake of divine and brotherly love they offered up their bodies.

The brotherhood in general was, in consequence, kindled with zeal and love in such measure that they all despised that which is earthly and set their affections on heavenly things, standing in readiness for the same sufferings that had befallen their brethren and that were threatening themselves also. In showing hospitality to their brethren they regarded no danger to which they exposed themselves thereby. They visited those that were imprisoned, and comforted and strengthened them at the places of execution by calling to them with appropriate words of Scripture.

The tyrants were put to shame, they failed in what they undertook to do. It was their aim to cause these Christians to apostatize from the faith, but by the persecution they only gave them opportunity to prove the genuineness of their profession. The persecutors put forth every effort to destroy those who differed from them in faith, but the number of the believers only increased in consequence. Many were led to inquire after the truth, and were finally brought to conversion through witnessing the sad spectacle of the execution of those who were innocent of transgression and who would suffer death rather than to depart from what they recognized as the divine truth.

In those times of cross-bearing, when we could come together only under danger of life, the zeal for the cause of the Lord was such that we nevertheless met frequently. Often we came together at night time and under very difficult conditions, in corners and nooks, in fields and woods. How precious was the opportunity to spend an hour in mutual edification and strengthening each other in godliness! How thirsty and hungry were the souls for the divine food of the soul! How pleasing and satisfying was its taste! Every one was interested in lasting treasures, for natural treasures could not give comfort.

# THE THEOLOGY OF CONRAD GREBEL

Harold S. Bender

## A. Its Development

It is impossible to give a systematic presentation of the theology of Conrad Grebel; an exposition of the fundamental principles which he advocated is all that can be demanded. The explanation for this fact is easy to find. In the spring of 1522 Grebel was converted at about twenty-four years of age; four short years later, in the summer of 1526, he died as a refugee far from home. Of these four years, the year and a half after January, 1525, were spent as a legal outlaw according to the decree of the canton of Zurich, which meant that he was in constant danger of arrest and imprisonment. Of these eighteen months Grebel spent scarcely a month at home with his family and his books, while six months, from October, 1525, to March, 1526, were spent as a prisoner in the tower prison in Zurich. Under such circumstances theology is not likely to prosper. But even in the first years of Grebel's life as an evangelical Christian one could scarcely expect any great theological activity, for he had not devoted himself to theological interests before his conversion and it was months if not years until he was ripe enough to think reflectively and systematically about his experience. More than that, those first months and years were years in which the gospel itself was but gradually winning its way into the hearts of the people of Zurich, as Zwingli preached. In the midst of problems of all kinds, theological and ecclesiastical, which demanded solution, what could a young and growing Christian do but wait for clarity and inner assurance until he should be ripe to form his own judgments and come to his own decisions. Conrad Grebel scarcely reached this stage before the year 1524.

But there is another reason why Grebel's theological thinking was not systematic. It was the fruit of struggle with the real and living problems of the church of his time. He struggled with the acute problems of tithes and usury, of baptism and the other ordinances, and finally and above all with the shaping of the life of the church and the fashioning of the daily life of the individual Christian after the example of Christ. Grebel's theological thinking was

thus not systematic because it was first of all "existentiell." One point, the authority of the gospel, was taken for granted by Grebel; it was a matter about which he never had to struggle. For this reason he never felt the need for a theological examination of the problem of how to use the Scripture.

Fortunately the period when Grebel first began to struggle with the issues of the day was for him a time of comparative peace and quiet at home in Zurich. For several months during the spring and summer of 1524 he had time to think, and time to give expression to his inner urge to deal with the problems of the time in writing. His first and most important theological composition, his epistle to Thomas Müntzer, was written at the beginning of September, 1524. At that time he says that he was "full of words," and that he felt himself driven by the spirit to testify to others of the truth which had taken possession of his own soul.[1] At that time he mentioned a plan to write two booklets, but he had scarcely begun with them when the onrushing affairs of life broke off abruptly and forever the peaceful labors which might have led to a more systematic construction of his theology. The short petition which he wrote to the city council in December, 1524, and in which he dealt with the question of baptism, was a document written in the heat of the beginning struggle. With the disputation of January 17, 1525, and the strict mandate of the following day, the crowded and bitter months of labor and suffering were upon him. There were other and more pressing duties than writing theology. He became an evangelist, an itinerant preacher, a personal worker, everything else than a theologian. Even his correspondence with his friends came to an end. Only with difficulty was he able to have a small pamphlet against Zwingli's defense of infant baptism published, and then death took him. What we have of Grebel's theology is only a number of fragments, and the fragments, with exception of the epistle of Müntzer, are all apologetic or polemic in character, dealing chiefly with the question of baptism.

Finally it dare not be forgotten that Grebel had no theological training of any sort. Hubmaier, Reublin, Menno Simons, and

---

1. Grebel to Vadian, Sept. 3, 1524, *Vad. BrS.* III, 85: "Plenus sum enim sermonibus, et coartat me spiritus uteri mei." It is a quotation from Job 32:18. He mentions here the two writings he is planning; "postremo omnium est, quod conscribam et colligam locos-nempe duos communes, nisi alius quispiam praeveniat, in publicum deturbaturus."

others had studied theology, but Grebel was a humanist. He had read Homer, Vergil, and Horace; he had studied poetry and geography; but of the Bible and the great theologians of the church he had learned nothing. Neither did Grebel have practical experience in ecclesiastical matters. Other Anabaptist leaders had been active in practical life as preachers, as priests, as teachers, or as monks, before they joined the movement. But Grebel had been only a student, who had spent five years in distant lands and then had come home without even completing his studies.

The rudimentary character of Conrad Grebel's theology is therefore the result of the practical circumstances of his life and of his earlier development. It would be a vain endeavor to seek to find in his scanty writings a systematic and complete theology, when he himself had not developed it in his own thinking.

Furthermore, the available testimony does not permit the portrayal of development in Grebel's theology, for the period of time involved is too short and the extent of the content is too meagre. Except for a few incidental remarks in earlier letters, the chief witnesses, which are the epistle to Müntzer, the "Protest," and the letter from Hegenwalt, all come from the same time, a period of about three months from September to the beginning of December, 1525. The later archival material is too meagre to permit the idea of a later stage of development, and even so it agrees completely with the spirit of the chief writings mentioned above. The *Taufbüchlein* of 1526 treats only of the question of baptism and does not manifest any progress in thought over the earlier writings. It is plain then that the three chief writings named above constitute the chief basis for the delineation of Grebel's theology.

## B. The Documentary Sources for the Theology of Grebel

### 1. *The Evaluation of the Sources*

The first question that faces one who seeks to gather the sources for Conrad Grebel's theology is a methodological problem. It is the question as to what sources shall be recognized as valid. Grebel's own letters and writings belong without question in the list; the autographs have all been preserved, with the exception of the booklet of 1526. The statements made by Grebel in court are probably also reliable, although it should not be forgotten that the minutes of the trials are not altogether above criticism. Too often the

clerk of the court repeats the words of the witnesses in condensed form, and one can never be sure whether he reproduces the exact words or allows his prejudices to color the final form. When the testimony before the court is the testimony of others than Grebel himself, the problem becomes still more difficult. Statements made by friends may well be accepted, but accusations by enemies need to be critically examined, particularly if the statements are mere hearsay evidence and rumors of second and third hand. A document such as the letter of Erhard Hegenwalt to Grebel, who makes assertions on the basis of statements in Grebel's letter to him, may be accepted as reliable.

A second question is whether testimony concerning the teaching of friends and co-workers of Grebel is to be accepted as evidence of Grebel's own views. This would involve testimony about the teaching of Manz, Blaurock, Castelberger, and the brethren in Grüningen and Zollikon. While such material has value, yet it does not merit full acceptance in the strictest sense of the term. The reason for this is that although the Brethren in general fellowshipped together, although they labored together and considered themselves as a body to be the church of Christ, they did not before Grebel's death set up binding statements of faith in the form of confessions or creeds or even a church discipline. In the early days of the movement, under the pressure of circumstances, each man had to stand more or less on his own theological feet. Gradually the intimate co-operation and fellowship of months and years brought a more complete unity in faith and teaching. Furthermore, many of the early Brethren were simple peasants and artisans, some of whom could neither read or write, and who at any rate gave little thought to precision of doctrine. William Exel of Wallis, for instance, was one who "could neither write nor read."[2] Again, the leaders were not altogether similar in ideas, in attitudes, and in emphasis. Some of the trials brought forth evident differences in point of view. The most substantial difference was that between Blaurock and Grebel. Blaurock had not fellowshipped with the Brethren before the first disputation in Zurich, and after that he and Grebel were really very seldom together, except for a few days in January, 1525, and then for a short time at the end of the sum-

2. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, April 4, 1526, No. 691, p. 307. Citation according to Correll, since Egli is incomplete.

mer of that year in Grüningen. It was only in prison from October 1525, to March, 1526, that they first really had intimate fellowship. Blaurock was different in temperament from Grebel. He was a strongly developed, vigorous, independent personality, a man of action, somewhat of an enthusiast in contrast to the more moderate and balanced Grebel. Even Manz was more radical than Grebel, and seems to have been attracted far more to Blaurock, for the two of them were frequently together, while Grebel often went his own way. It is doubtful whether one should really think of a permanent working co-operation between the three men. For this reason, it would probably be better to use testimony about the views of Blaurock and Manz only in the negative sense. That would mean that views which they deny, should likewise not be attributed to Grebel, but that views which they held are not necessarily therefore to be counted as Grebel's. In general it is correct to say that the program of Blaurock and Manz, at the outset at least, was more radical and not so soberly tempered as Grebel's program. The only testimony regarding Castelberger's views falls in the early period (January, 1523),[3] but it may be allowed some weight, since he and Grebel were later good friends.

Testimony regarding the views of such Anabaptists as the brethren at Zollikon and Grüningen should also be used chiefly on the negative principle.[4] It is true that Grebel's influence must have worked among them, but foreign brethren from St. Gall, Chur, and Waldshut, also influenced them, and they were Anabaptist leaders with whom Grebel had little or no contact. It is therefore difficult to say to what extent Grebel's views coincided with the views of these groups.

Documents containing the testimony of opponents and enemies of the Anabaptists of Zurich should naturally be treated as polemic material and of little value. The contemporary chroniclers seldom report more than a few general observations, and reflect usually

3. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, Jan. 20, 1523, No. 623, pp. 276-278. The date was corrected by Egli himself from 1523 to 1525.

4. Two letters from the Zollikon brethren to the council, Egli, *Aktensammlung*, March, 1525, No. 674, p. 300, and the "Grüninger Eingabe," Egli, *Aktensammlung*, No. 1201, pp. 547-548, are incompletely reproduced. It should be stated here that the possible excessive caution which I am here advocating does not mean that I believe that any major difference in doctrine existed between Grebel and his brethren. On the contrary I believe that they were substantially in accord. I merely wish to insist on a thoroughly sound method in deriving material on which to make positive statements about Grebel's theology.

the current opinions of the group to which they belong, whether Evangelical or Catholic. Only Kessler reports more extensively and with a certain objectivity; some of his material is usable. Zwingli's own testimony as to the teaching of the Zurich Anabaptists (as found in *Wer Ursach gebe Zu Aufruhr, Taufbüchlein, Elenchus*) is for the most part to be rejected, and for three reasons. In the first place he never mentions the views of any specific leader, not even Grebel. Second, his attitude is strongly polemical and altogether lacking in objectivity.[5] What he does write is written with the purpose of presenting the Anabaptists to the people of Zurich and to the world at large in the worst possible light, and to show that Zwingli had nothing to do with the new heresy. In the third place Zwingli's testimony is not always contemporary for Grebel, particularly in parts of the *Elenchus;* that is, it consists of a recall of statements made by Grebel one to three years earlier, and exact recall is practically impossible. In general therefore Zwingli's testimony concerning the teaching of the Anabaptists is also subject in use to the negative principle, namely, that his statements are to be accepted only when they are favorable to the Anabaptists or affirm an agreement between him and them. For instance, Zwingli's assertion that the differences between him and the Brethren concerned only outward things and did not touch the inner life is to be accepted as plausible.[6] Later polemic writings against the Brethren, such as Bullinger's works, naturally have no value for the determination of Grebel's theology.

### 2. *List of the Sources*

The list of sources given below has been prepared on the basis of the methodological principles established in the preceding section, and is here presented in order to give a brief and systematic survey of the material available.

#### *List of the Sources for the Theology of Conrad Grebel Arranged in Chronological Order and According to Value*

#### A. Self-Testimony by Conrad Grebel

I. *Letters.* All letters are addressed to Vadian, except the last which is addressed to Andreas Castelberger. (*) designates the more important let-

5. See Blanke's opinion, *Zwingli Werke* VI, 32, note 2: "Zwingli's drei Entstehungsberichte sind also keine tendenzlose Geschichtsquellen, sondern sie verfolgen jedesmal die gleiche bestimmte Absicht", i. e., "dass das Täufertum eine sektiererische Richtung sei und dass er das an Hand der Entstehungsgeschichte beweisen wolle."

6. Cf. *Zwingli Werke* IV, 206, 316, and III 406, 872.

ters, only two of which however rank as outstanding,—the one of Dec. 15, 1524 and the one of May 30, 1525.

1522: Nov. 2, Dec. 1, *Dec. 29.
1523: *July 13, July 14, July 28, Aug. 11, *Nov. 12, Dec. 18.
1524: Feb. 25, *Sept. 3, *Oct. 14, *Dec. 15.
1525: Jan. 14, *May 20, *End of May.

II. *Statements before the court.* All are found in Egli's *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation.*

1525: Nov. 8-18, Egli No. 692.
1526: March 5-7, Egli Nos. 933, 934.

III. *Writings.*

1522, Aug. 23: In Gratiam Reducis Evangelii (published as an appendix to Zwingli's *Apologeticus Archeteles*).
1524, Sept. 5: "Epistle" to Thomas Münzer, not published.
1524, December: "Protestation und Schutzschrift" to the council at Zurich, not published.
1526, Spring: "Taufbuchlein."

## B. Testimony by Others

I. *Letters.*

1525, Jan. 1: Erhart Hegenwalt to Grebel.

II. *Statements before the court* (The dates given below represent the time of Grebel's supposed statements, not the date of the documentation or report).

1. By Friends:
   1525, Feb. to July: Egli Nos. 636, 674, 792, 797, 938.
2. By Opponents:
   (a) Zwingli
   1524, Spring: Egli, No. 692
   (b) Hofmeister
   1525, February: Egli, No. 692

(The list given is incomplete)

## C. Testimonies concerning the Doctrine of the Zurich Anabaptists

I. *Self-testimony of the Anabaptists*

1. Andreas Castelberger, January, 1523 (Egli, No. 623)
2. Felix Manz, November, 1525 (Egli No. 692).
3. Georg Blaurock, February 18, 1525 (Egli, No. 646); November, 1525 (Egli, No. 692); March, 1526 (Egli, No. 933).
4. The Zollikon Brethren, Feb. 6, 1525 (Egli, no. 636); March, 1525 (Egli, no. 674); June, 1525 (Egli, no. 762).
5. The Grüningen "Eingabe," June, 1527, (Egli, no. 1201).

II. *Zwingli's polemic writings against the Brethren.*

1. December, 1524: *Wer Ursach Gebe zu Aufruhr* (*Zwingli Werke* III, pp. 355-469)
2. May, 1525: *Von der Taufe, von der Wiedertaufe und von der Kindertaufe* (*Zwingli Werke* IV, pp. 188-337)
3. July, 1527: *In catabaptistarum strophas elenchus* (*Zwingli Werke* VI, 1-?)

III. *Contemporary Chronicles*
1. 1524-1533, Johannes Kesslers Sabbata pp. 141-2.

### 3. *Description of Grebel's Theological Writings*

#### (A) In Gratiam Reducis Evangelii
#### August 23, 1522

Grebels first theological writing was a short Latin poem of sixteen lines composed in the rare "Phalaecean" meter,[7] which appeared as an appendix to Zwingli's booklet entitled *Apologeticus Archeteles,* which was published August 23, 1522.

Zwingli's booklet was in reality a reckoning with the supporters of the old faith, a "first and last" ("Archeteles") word. In form it is a reply to the admonition which the bishop of Constance had directed to the canons of Zurich on May 24, 1522, in regard to the transgression of the Lenten Fast. But in content it is nothing less than an exposition of the fundamental principle by which Zwingli intended to carry through his reform. It is a defense of the Scripture as the sole authority in matters of faith, and is characterized by strong invective against the papacy as well as joyful testimony for the gospel. The importance of the theme is emphasized by the vigor of the language.

Grebel's poem is cast in the same spirit as that of the book itself and easily competes with it in vigor of language. In happy exultation Grebel celebrates the overthrow of the episcopacy and the victory of the gospel. The bishops had enslaved the people with their bulls and decrees and by the promotion of a despicable superstition. But now God has set up again in all its former glory His divine Word. The gospel has victoriously broken the chains of its servitude, and victorious it will remain. The spirit of the poem gives abundant evidence that Grebel like Zwingli had adopted with his whole heart the sole authority of Scripture as the foundation for faith and as the guiding principle of life. In the light of history, it is symbolical that this poem, with its emphasis upon the authority of Scripture, stands as the first witness to Grebel's theology. Grebel adopted as his own the so-called "formal principle" of the Reformation, the *sola scriptura,* and to this principle he re-

7. The Phalaecean meter is based on a line of eleven syllables divided into five feet. It was named from Phalaecus an Alexandrian poet who used it, and was used in Latin by Catullus, Petronius, and especially by Martial. It was employed chiefly for epigrams.

mained true throughout his life. Zwingli on the contrary, according to Grebel's sincere conviction, abandoned this principle at a decisive point and in a critical moment, so that a year and a half later Grebel felt justified in condemning Zwingli's changed position in the following sharp words: "Zwingli, the herald of the Word, has cast down the Word, has trodden it under feet, and has brought it into captivity."[8]

### (B) Epistle to Thomas Müntzer

### September 5, 1524

The epistle which Grebel wrote to Thomas Müntzer[8a] on September 5, 1524, in the name of his brethren and with their signatures, is the most extensive and important document for Grebel's theology. In extent it is larger than all the other theological writings put together (four thousand words in contrast to three thousand three hundred). It is also the only writing which deals with other questions than baptism. It is significant also because it is the *first* witness for the theology of the Swiss brethren, whose leader Conrad Grebel had already become, as this letter clearly shows. Although it bears the form of a letter it is truly much more than that, and certainly belongs with the theological writings as such. Since the origin and general character of the epistle has already been thoroughly discussed [in Chapter X of my Grebel biography][9] it will not be necessary to repeat that discussion, and it will be possible to proceed at once to the analysis of its content.

The epistle has a peculiar double character. On the one hand it pays homage to Müntzer "together with Carolostadio" as "the purest heralds and preachers of the purest, divine Word." On the other hand, and this is its primary purpose, it constitutes a strong criticism of Müntzer. In fact the whole epistle, except for the short introduction and the similarly short conclusion, is cast in the form of an admonition and instruction to Müntzer. However, in spite of this superficial form, it is in reality just as much an exposition of Grebel's teaching on the points on which he disagreed with Müntzer. From this point of view it should be treated as a presentation of the program of Conrad Grebel and his followers. Unfortunately

8. Grebel to Vadian, Dec. 18, 1523, *Vad. BrS.* III, 50.

8a. Following the usage in Boehmer-Kirn, the spelling "Müntzer" is used instead of Münzer.

9. The Grebel biography will be published in book form in the early part of 1938.

the discussion is not rounded out in a systematic fashion, and really consists only of a succession of individual points.

The epistle was occasioned by the situation in which the Reformation found itself in Zurich at this time, a situation similar to that at Wittenberg, and it is only on the basis of this background that the epistle is to be understood. Grebel devotes the opening section, therefore, to a brief sketch of this situation, and gives thereby in reality a brief history and interpretation of the Reformation up to this time. It is a sort of philosophy of that history and furnishes a justification for the rejection by Grebel of the previous program of the reformers. Grebel acknowledges the valuable service which the evangelical preachers, that is the reformers at Wittenberg and Zurich, have rendered to the evangelical cause, and which they were in part still performing. They had uncovered the apostasy of the old church. But up to the present they had not restored Christianity in a satisfactory fashion, neither as far as the organization and ordinances of the church were concerned nor in regard to the Christian life of the individual believer. Faith, concerning which there was so much talk, had remained an external and deceptive faith which had failed to produce fruit in life, for sin still reigned everywhere and the church had failed to exercise discipline. Even the ancient papal and anti-Christian forms of baptism and the Lord's supper were still maintained. It was clear that instead of actually putting into practice the principle of the complete and sole authority of the Scripture, the reformers were still paying altogether too much attention to the authority of men, even though those men were the reformers themselves. The chief cause for this failure of the reformers had been "the false forbearance" ("das falsche schonen") practiced by them. With this expression Grebel condemns the tactics of the slow and cautious advance which Luther and Zwingli were using. What these men no doubt sincerely considered to be wisdom and prudence, Grebel saw as a spiritless slipping along, as a compromising yielding which was bound to result in serious dangers.

In contrast to these tactics Grebel advocates an heroic and unconditional obedience to divine truth. He will have no half and half, he would proceed at once to the erection of the true church of Christ according to the standard of the gospel. The Word of God alone should be the guide, without admixture of human wisdom.

Of the strategy of "false forbearance" and of human calculation Grebel has had enough. In fact he has had so much of it in Zurich that he has lost confidence in the shepherds there. In like fashion Zwingli had lost confidence in the impetuous young radicals of Zurich, so much that he openly and from the pulpit in Zurich condemned them as "angels of Satan." The breach on both sides was complete. This was the situation in Zurich.

Now what pleased Grebel and his brethren in Müntzer was just this, that he openly and decisively advocated the principle of absolute and unconditional obedience to the Scripture. Müntzer, so it seemed, was also one of those who had had enough of "false forbearance." He was not afraid of either the reformers or the princes. That was the right spirit, there was a man after their own hearts, thought the Brethren in Zurich. In this sense they also wanted to be, in fact they already were, "seven new young Müntzers."[10]

But it was only in a formal sense on the basis of the principle of unconditional obedience to the scriptures that the Brethren were agreed with Müntzer, for as soon as they examined Müntzer's program in detail they saw that they would have to disagree with it. Four points which they found in Müntzer's program they at once rejected decisively and completely. They were: (1) the introduction of singing in worship, (2) the adoption of a German liturgy as a substitute for the Latin mass, (3) the erection of stone tablets of the ten commandments in the church, (4) the endorsement of violent resistance against oppression and persecution. And in three additional points concerning which they were not sure about Müntzer's position, they also took a negative stand. These were (1) Müntzer still accepts his salary, the income from a benefice, whereas the preacher of the gospel should be supported by voluntary donations of the church and not through money derived from usury and tithes; (2) the Brethren doubt whether Müntzer has actually erected a true Christian church with discipline according to Matthew 18; (3) they doubt also whether Müntzer's actual practice in baptism agrees with the views expressed in his writings, and for this reason they admonish him to cease to baptize children. In the last point their doubts were altogether justified, for Müntzer still baptized children. In fact he apparently never abandoned infant baptism

10. The signature of the appendix to the letter.

in practice as long as he continued as the responsible pastor of a parish.

Finally, to round out the characterization of the epistle, it should be said that the spirit throughout is thoroughly religious. The social interest which is prominent with Müntzer appears only indirectly with Grebel. Grebel is concerned with establishing the church of Christ on earth according to the gospel, not with leading a social revolution. This does not mean that Grebel had no interest in social problems, it only means that with him the dominant interest is the church, its essence and its evangelical function, which does not include socio-political concerns. The latter concerns lie on another level of living.

Grebel continues to describe the situation in which the Brethren found themselves in Zurich, by relating how they were strengthened in their attitude by the reading of Müntzer's tract because they saw that he, like they, had the courage to attack the weaknesses of the reformers. They desired to strengthen him in his attitude so that he should not fall away from the divine principle which he had adopted. The admonition of Grebel to Müntzer in this respect is not only the high point in the epistle, it is a classical theological locus for Conrad Grebel's whole writing. "Therefore we entreat and admonish you as a brother by the name, power, word, spirit, and salvation, which has come to all Christians through Jesus Christ our Master and Saviour, that you would earnestly endeavor to preach unafraid only the divine Word, erect and defend only divine institutions, cherish alone what is good and right, namely what may be found in pure and clear Scripture, and reject, hate, and curse all proposals, words, opinions, and institutions of all men, including your own."[11]

Having given this general endorsement and admonition to Müntzer the criticism begins. "We understand and have observed that you have translated the mass into German and that you have ordained a new German liturgy. This cannot be good, for we find in the New Testament no teaching about singing (and liturgy)." This sentence announces Grebel's method; everything must be tested by the New Testament, and what is not found therein as the teaching of Christ and the apostles or as an apostolic practice, must be aban-

11. Grebel to Müntzer, Sept. 5, 1524, in Boehmer-Kirn, *Thomas Müntzer's Briefwechsel, Leipzig,* 1931. p. 93.

doned. To this first principle a second standard is added; everything must edify, must produce a right true faith, and dare not lead to an "external hypocritical faith." It is clear that Grebel is concerned not primarily about an outward form, not to have an outward legalistic biblicism, but desires to secure inner life, to have reality. To Grebel the reformers are the men who are creating and promoting an externalistic type of Christianity. It is remarkable in this connection to note that the reformers likewise accused the Anabaptists of the external legalism of a "hypocritical faith," an accusation which is still made today and still believed. Whatever justification there might be for such an accusation in relation to other Anabaptist leaders and groups, it certainly is not justified in reference to Grebel and the first Swiss brethren.

The construction of the epistle to Müntzer is fairly clear. Following the introduction and the general account of the Reformation as reported above, Grebel undertakes the criticism of various points in Müntzer's practice. He deals with seven points, as noticed above: liturgy, mass (Lord's Supper), benefices, tablets, church discipline, force (sword), and baptism. Let us briefly consider his discussion of these points.

(1) *Liturgy or singing.* Grebel proves with nine numbered arguments that singing does not belong in worship; (1) there is no example or teaching about it in the New Testament, (2) it does not edify, (3) Paul forbids singing (Eph. 5, Col. 3), (4) what the Scripture does not positively teach and command is forbidden, (5) Christ requires only the preaching of the Word, (6) human beings may not add to the Word, (7) singing is not justified as a means to eliminate the mass, (8 and 9) it was not ordained of God and must therefore be rooted out.

It must be admitted that Grebel's arguments do not carry weight today; they are for the most part artificial arguments. This is due to the fact that Grebel felt it necessary to find scriptural proofs for a position which cannot be supported from Scripture. The only deeper argument is that contained in a remark under point (5), where Grebel says, "he who sings poorly is annoyed, and he who can sing well becomes proud." But even this observation is not always true. However, although the arguments which Grebel uses are weak, his general position is not so far wrong for his time. Grebel was striking at liturgical singing by the clergy. No

less a one than Zwingli himself shared Grebel's views on this point, and it is altogether possible that Grebel derived his views from Zwingli. In the year 1525 such singing actually was suppressed in Zurich and the organ was stilled. In the year 1527 Zwingli went still further and abolished all singing by the congregation because he feared that the external form would interfere with the inner life. Zwingli was no enemy of culture and music, for he himself was a poet and a musician. Grebel likewise was not on this account an enemy of culture and of music, for what he desired was to keep the worship of the church as purely spiritual as possible. If the nine arguments of Grebel are omitted, his position is seen to be the same as that of Zwingli.

(2) *The mass or Lord's Supper.* In sixteen numbered arguments Grebel points out the dangers associated with outward ceremonies in worship and opposes a ritualistic conception of the Lord's Supper. (a) The mass is not to be reformed but abolished (points 7 to 10. In points 7 to 9 there is a certain double reference to liturgy and mass). (b) Only the words of Jesus are to be used, and they are not to be thought of as a "consecration" (point 12). (c) In order to avoid a "hypocritical devotion" and the worship of bread and a "falling away from the spiritual," everything unusual in connection with the celebration must be avoided, consequently no special bread, no special cup, "no priestly customs and clothing" for the mass, no singing, no additions (points 13, 14, and 24). (d) The Lord's Supper, if it be received in faith and love, signifies "a union with Christ and the brethren" (points 16 and 17). (e) Therefore the Lord's Supper cannot be taken without "condemnation" if a sincere brotherly life is lacking (points 18 and 19). (f) It is a meal of fellowship, not a sacrament, and for this reason it shall not be celebrated by any one person alone, neither by the preacher nor by the sick person (point 20). (g) It shall not be celebrated in the church house, for that leads to a "false devotion" (celebrated in houses?) (point 21). (h) "It shall be practiced often and used much" (point 22). (i) Discipline according to the rule of Christ (in Matthew 18) must precede, for love is destroyed if one has fellowship with "false brethren" (point 23). (k) The time of the celebration could be in the evening after the example of Christ and the Corinthian Church, but no fixed time is to be required (point 25).

It is clear from the above analysis that what Grebel is seeking to accomplish by his "rules" is a strengthening of the inner devotion, and that he desires to make the Lord's Supper a true expression of faith and of the fellowship of brotherly love. All the details are to be so ordered that the participant "shall be reminded of the body and blood of Christ, of the testament on the cross, so that he shall be willing to live and to suffer for the sake of Christ and the brethren, the head and members of the body," as Grebel says so plainly in point 19.

After Grebel has concluded his arguments in the matter of mass and liturgy he takes up the practical question as to whether it is possible for Müntzer to carry through everything at once in the light of the practical situation facing him. In his counsel to Müntzer on the point Grebel shows clearly that he is in no sense a fanatic who is ready to hew away impetuously regardless of the consequence. He reveals himself as a sober and considerate leader. If Müntzer cannot set up scriptural practices at once, says Grebel, he should rather wait and let things stay as they are and continue the Latin liturgy, although omitting the mass. He should proceed to instruct the people as to what the ideal should be and should wait until he can carry that ideal through for it is much better "that a little should be done right according to the Word of God and in a right faith and practice rather than that much should be attempted which would lead to a mixing of true and false faith."

(3) *Benefices.* As a further proof that Grebel demands a thoroughgoing separation from the old priestcraft and will not tolerate compromise, he advises Müntzer to surrender entirely the income from his benefice. "If your benefice is supported by tithes and usury as with us, and if you are not supported by the whole church, will you not give up your benefice. You well know how a shepherd should be supported." With this demand Grebel follows the example of the New Testament, but he also without doubt expresses the general feeling of the common people in Zurich.

(4) *Tablets.* The stone tablets containing the ten commandments which Müntzer had set up a short time before in his church should be removed at once as without foundation in Scripture and as simply a human notion.

(5) *Church Discipline.* The mention of this point brings Grebel back again to his fundamental principle, that the Christian church

must be organized exclusively according to "the rule of Christ." Grebel wonders whether Müntzer has actually done this in the full sense of the term. For instance, he must establish Christian discipline according to Matthew 18, and the brother who does not improve his life according to the gospel after instruction and admonition must be excluded from the church according to the rule of Christ.

(6) *The Sword.* Another requirement of the gospel which Grebel fears that Müntzer does not recognize is that of non-resistance under oppression and persecution. For Grebel the church is a suffering church with no right to use the sword or to engage in war. "True believing Christians are sheep among wolves, sheep for the slaughter, who must be baptised in anxiety and need, tribulation, persecution, suffering and death, who must be tested in the fire, and who must find the homeland of eternal rest not by the means of killing but by spiritual means. They use neither worldly sword nor war, for among them killing is done away with all together." With these clear and strong words Grebel advocates not only the negative non-resistance of suffering, but the positive requirement of refusal to kill. It is noteworthy that Grebel bases his rejection of the sword and war and of killing as a whole, not upon the specific teaching of the Sermon on the Mount but upon the thought of the suffering church. Much has been said and written about "a Sermon on the Mount ethic" among the Anabaptists. Certainly the brethren believed in the Sermon on the Mount and were inspired by it, but there is no evidence that Conrad Grebel either here in the matter of non-resistance nor anywhere else derived his ethical principles exclusively or even primarily from the Sermon on the Mount. Not one single citation from it is to be found in the entire scope of his writings, including his letters.

(7) *Baptism.* The last major part of the epistle to Müntzer deals with the question of baptism. Here Grebel concerns himself with an exposition of the significance of baptism rather than with a refutation of infant baptism by Scripture passages. According to Grebel, baptism signifies for him who has come to Christ through repentance and a change of heart, "that his sins have been washed away through his faith and the blood of Christ, that he has died to sin, and that he must now live in newness of life and spirit, and that he will surely be saved if he has the inner baptism of faith and

lives according to its meaning." It would be difficult for Grebel to have expressed more clearly the significance of baptism as a symbol (with backward reference to regeneration and forward reference to sanctification) and as a pledge for a constant renewal of life. Hence Grebel says it does not depend so much upon the age, whether the candidate for baptism is a child or an adult, as upon the attitude. In addition Grebel rejects the conception held at Wittenberg that baptism "strengthens and increases faith." He also rejects the teaching of the church fathers "such as Augustine, Tertullian, Theophylact, and Cyprian," that "baptism saves." This teaching of the fathers "discredits faith and the suffering of Christ for the adult, and the suffering of Christ for unbaptised children." As proof that children are saved without baptism Grebel refers to twenty passages in the Old and New Testament without quoting them in detail. The new baptismal forms devised by Luther, Leo Jud, Osiander, and those at Strasbourg, as well as several "still more shameful" forms, are to be rejected as "treasonable and as exceptional blasphemies,"[12] because they retain infant baptism. The fact that the scholars still hold fast to infant baptism is clear evidence for Grebel that all those who are opposing infant baptism, as for example the brethren in Zurich, are certain to meet persecution.

At the conclusion of his epistle Grebel again testifies to the fellowship which the Brethren in Zurich hope to maintain with Müntzer, requests mutual intercession, and expresses the hope that Müntzer will soon reply.

## The Appendix

The appendix to the epistle to Müntzer, which Grebel wrote a few days after September 5, 1524, is not so extensive as the epistle itself but is perhaps even more important, for it contains the reaction of the brethren to the latest news about Müntzer which had reached them after the writing of the epistle itself.

12. Luther's Taufbüchlein, *Das taufbuchlin verdeutscht,* was published soon after Easter 1523. Leo Jud's *Taufliturgie* was an imitation: *Ein kurze und gemeine Form fuer die schwach gleubigen kinder zu Thouffen . . .* Zurich, summer of 1523. Andreas Osiander's *Ordnung wie man Tauffet, bissher im Latein gehalten, verteutscht . . .* appeared in Nürnberg, 1524. The Strassburg booklet was published with the title: *Ordnung des Herrn Nachtmal; so man die mess nennet, sampt der Tauff un Insegnung der Ee, wie jetzt die diener des wort Gottes zu Strassburg, erneuert, und nach göttlicher geschrift gebessert haben uss ursach in nachgehender epistel gemeldet.* See Gustav Kawerau, "Liturgische Studien zu Luthers Taufbüchlein", in *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben,* Leipzig, 1889.

They had heard three things: (1) Luther has attacked Müntzer severely in a "shameful booklet;" (2) Müntzer is in danger of persecution; and (3) Müntzer has advocated a program of violence against the princes, that is, he has endorsed war. The new Müntzer with whom the brethren have now become acquainted is different from the old, and the brethren vigorously express themselves on all three points.

(1) Grebel considers the attack by Luther against Müntzer to be unjust, at least on the basis of Müntzer's writing which Grebel has carefully re-read. However, although Grebel does not believe that Müntzer rejects baptism as Luther charges, he is no longer sure about Müntzer's attitude on the question, although he hopes that Müntzer is against infant baptism and a false use of the ordinance. (2) Müntzer is admonished not to let threatened persecution frighten him, although Luther is apparently ready "to hand him over to the princes and the headsman." Grebel admonishes him to cling closer to the Bible which will be his protection, and not to fall away and follow the "false forbearance" of the Luther group, but rather continue immovably to preach and to practice the clear Word of God. The Brethren in Zurich also expect persecution, for they have already been grievously slandered by their shepherds. But it must be so, "Christ must suffer still more in his members," but He will strengthen them and hold them fast until the end. They should pray for one another. (3) The fact that Müntzer now advocates the use of violence, seriously diminishes the good opinion which the Brethren had of him, for hitherto he had pleased them "better than any other in Germany or elsewhere." Hence Grebel admonishes Müntzer very earnestly to drop this point, together with the other points of the tablets and of singing. Particularly he should not seek to justify and maintain these points in case he falls into the hands of Luther and the Duke of Saxony.

The suspicion and fear that Müntzer is after all not quite sound and reliable, and that he has mixed human wisdom with the Word of God, disturbs Grebel very much, so much that he cannot get rid of the thought. He returns a second time to discuss the point. By no means dare Müntzer act "according to human opinions", whether of his own or of other men, and if he has already made a step in this false direction, he must retrace his steps, and in the future must follow only the clear Word of God and the rule of Christ, and

"establish and teach only an unadulterated baptism and an unadulterated Lord's Supper." If it is impossible to depend in the future on Müntzer and others like him such as Strauss, Carlstadt, and Stiefel, then matters have come to a serious pass in the world as far as the Gospel is concerned, then the Wittenberg and Zurich shepherds will continue in their "Scripture perversion" from one blindness to another, of this Grebel is certain. And because he fears this very thing, it begins to appear to Grebel that the reformers will gradually become as bad as the "papists". As for Grebel and his group, they will for their part continue immovably on their course, they will continue to point out the shortcomings of the leaders as they have already done, personally in Zurich, and by letter in Wittenberg.

In conclusion Grebel assures Müntzer once more that the Brethren in Zurich have written to him only out of love, because they and Müntzer stand on the same platform in the matter of teaching, and face the same opposition and persecution.

The appendix is of great importance because it demonstrates unmistakably that Grebel and his brethren maintained an independent position over against Müntzer. They do not spare their new-found hero in any respect. If he deviates from their fundamental principle of the sole authority of Scripture he is lost and the great cause of the gospel can no longer use him. On three points Grebel is certain that Müntzer has already stepped aside: violence, singing, and tablets. And in the chief ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, he is in grave danger of polluting the divine Word by the addition of human wisdom.

If Grebel had been able to foresee Müntzer's later development and his future program, it is certain without a shadow of a doubt, in the light of his attitude in the appendix, that he would have dropped Müntzer without hesitation; that is the primary significance of this document. The principle of loyalty to the Scripture must reign, regardless of who must be cast aside.

### (C) The Petition of Protest and Defense
### Early December, 1524

The above title was assigned for the first time in 1910 by Emil Egli to a document submitted by Conrad Grebel to the city council of Zurich. The autograph itself is without a title, and likewise without a date and signature, but there is no question as to its author-

ship or as to the approximate time of composition. It is rather brief, having less than two thousand words, and being without paragraphs.

In spite of the brevity of the writing it is rich in content. It is essentially an appeal to the Zurich authorities to adopt a scriptural policy in the matter of baptism, which would mean the establishment in Zurich of the practice of adult baptism. As a foundation for his appeal Grebel proves that the only baptism which the Scripture teaches and which the apostles practiced was baptism upon the confession of faith.

The petition is clearly and harmoniously constructed, except for a few minor deviations and insertions, and falls into four unequal parts, which will now be analysed.

(1) *Introduction.* Grebel first specifies the question at issue. A number have recently advocated that infant baptism is scriptural while others have asserted on the contrary that infant baptism is an error and was invented by the pope. The defenders of infant baptism have endeavored to cloud the issue by confusing the question of baptism with the question of revolution, and have accused him, Conrad Grebel, of revolutionary agitation. This charge is patently false, but since it has been raised Grebel will refute it by an exposition of his position on baptism. He believes that it will be easy to settle the question of baptism if only everybody will stand fast on the principle which Zurich professes to follow, namely, the sole authority of the Scripture in matters of faith. However, this principle was not observed in the recent discussion, for although the shepherds, (Zwingli, Jud, and Grossmann) knew that infant baptism could not be found with Christ and the apostles, they nevertheless demanded from their opponents that which is impossible, namely, that they show a scriptural passage containing a positive prohibition of baptism. If one should proceed on such a basis, one would soon get far from Scripture. It is not unimportant that there are those in Zurich who desire to practice the only two sacraments differently than Christ taught them. So proceeds the introduction which constitutes about one fourth of the document.

(2) *Proof that baptism on confession of faith is the only scriptural baptism.* Approximately one half of the petition is devoted to a positive argument for believers' baptism. Beginning with John the Baptist and continuing with Christ and Pentecost on to Paul,

Grebel shows that both in theory and practice baptism was valid only for such as had experienced a renewal of life and as desired to continue in the new life of righteousness. He summarizes his position in a very clear and effective statement: "From these words it is clearly seen what baptism is and to whom baptism should be applied, namely, to one who has been converted by the Word of God, has changed his heart, and henceforth desires to walk in newness of life . . . . From this I have clearly learned and know assuredly, that baptism means nothing else than a dying of the old man, and a putting on of the new, and that Christ commanded to baptize those who had been taught, and that the apostles baptized no one except those who had been taught . . . . And whoever speaks or teaches anything different does that which he cannot prove by any Scripture, and I should like to hear anyone who can show to me by clear and plain Scripture, that John, Christ, or the apostles baptized children or taught that they should be baptized." At the conclusion of this examination of Scripture Grebel assures the council that he has taken his stand solely because of his love and devotion to the eternal truth of God; and he believes "that the eternal true Word of God will likewise sing into the heart of everyone . . . that this is the truth."

(3) *Practical Action.* In the third part Grebel discusses briefly the practical question of infant baptism. He admonishes the council to have the courage to abolish this "abomination" as they have abolished the other traditional abominations. Why Zwingli is not willing to do so Grebel does not understand, because he is sure that Zwingli in his heart does not believe in infant baptism. The council should proceed nevertheless because God's Word will overcome all opponents since nothing human can resist it. The objection that the form of baptism has no significance is rejected by Grebel with the argument that it is dangerous not to obey the commandments of God. As proof of this he points to the miserable end of the sons of Aaron. The council should not do as it did in the matter of images, namely, first accept the truth and then reject it, which cost the death of Klaus Hottinger. Grebel refutes as objection against the abolition of infant baptism and the introduction of believers' baptism the strange assertion that a change in the traditional custom in the matter would lead to a disturbance in civil affairs. (How often conservatives have opposed changes on the ground of en-

dangering the social order). He assured the council that the question of baptism had nothing to do at all with the state and civil affairs. Baptism could have no influence, either good or evil, on the public welfare. For this reason the council should refrain from using the police authority to support a particular form of baptism and to persecute the opponents of infant baptism.

(4) *Request for a written exchange of views.* In the fourth and final part of the petition Grebel requests a further written exchange of views with Zwingli on the question of baptism. Zwingli should be asked to defend his position in writing as he had done for other opponents on other questions. He, Grebel, would then reply in writing, for he was unable to accomplish anything in an oral disputation with Zwingli. He himself was no speaker and the previous discussions had led only to strife and contention. And if any one else in addition to Zwingli, whoever he might be, should undertake to demonstrate that infant baptism was scriptural (he believes that no one on earth can prove such a thing) Grebel offers to answer such an one.

## (D) The Booklet on Baptism

### Spring of 1526

Zwingli's last writing against the Anabaptists, *In Catabaptistarum Strophas Elenchus,* which was published at the end of July, 1527, was a refutation of two Anabaptist writings. One of them was the so-called "Schleitheim Articles," while the second had no title. One, if not both, of the writings were sent to Zwingli from Basel by Oekolampad on April 24, 1527. The small untitled writing had been sought by Zwingli for a long time in vain, for the Anabaptists in Zurich had circulated it secretly and had boasted that with it they were able to overcome Zwingli's principles.[13] No copy of the booklet has been preserved, but fortunately in his refutation of it, which constitutes the first part of the *Elenchus,* Zwingli followed a procedure which permits the reconstruction of the greater portion of the writing. What he did was to quote literally portions of the Anabaptist booklet in the form of a careful Latin translation from the Swiss in which it was written,[14] and to follow these ex-

13. *Elenchus,* p. 31. The citations from *Elenchus* are all taken from the critical edition, *Zwingli Werke* VI.

14. *Elenchus,* p. 30: "in duabus primis partibus priore semper loco ipsorum verba ponam fideliter ex Germanica in Latinam linguam traducta."

tracts with his refutation. As far as can be determined Zwingli omitted nothing of the original as far as he went, so that the portions translated represent a continuous document. When the translated passages are put together they constitute a short pamphlet of only 1300 words. It appears that Zwingli did not give a complete translation of the last part, although what remained, according to Zwingli's own statement, was not very much.[15] The original document was therefore a tract of about three-fourths the size of Grebel's "petition," and in printed form would scarcely have made more than six pages of a pamphlet in the customary small format of that time.

Zwingli called the writing a "booklet" ("libellum"). He did not call it expressly a printed booklet but since he did not emphasize the fact that it was a manuscript as he did in the case of the second booklet, it is altogether likely that it was printed. Twice he states that the original language was Swiss. The pamphlet was therefore apparently a small printed tract in the Swiss dialect.

The booklet appeared without an author and Zwingli did not undertake to name the person, although he had very definite suspicions as to his identity. Beginning with J. C. Füsslin (1753),[16] Conrad Grebel or Felix Manz have usually been suggested as the author, as for example, J. M. Usteri (1882),[17] and W. Koehler (1935).[18] Rudolph Staehelin (1895)[19] decided for Conrad Grebel as does also Blanke apparently (1935), although the latter is not quite willing to eliminate Manz altogether. Schuler and Schulthess (1832)[20] thought of Hubmaier, and A. Baur (1888)[21] defended this identification. Usteri (1890) opposed Baur.[22]

In my examination of the problem of authorship I follow for the most part the excellent discussion by Blanke in his commentary

15. *Zwingli Werke, Schuler und Schulthess* III, p. 387.

16. Füsslin, J. C., *Beyträge zur Erläuterung der Kirchen reformations-Geschichten des Schweizerlandes* V, Zürich 1753, p. 468.

17. Usteri, J. M. "Darstellung der Tauflehre Zwinglis" in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Gotha 1882, p. 222.

18. *Zwingli Werke* IV, p. 6.

19. Staehelin, *Huldreich Zwingli*, I, p. 528.

20. Schuler und Schulthess, *op. cit.* III, p. 362.

21. Baur, August, *Zwinglis Theologie* II, Halle 1888, p. 181; also "Zu Zwinglis Elenchus" in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* X, 1889, pp. 336 et passim.

22. Usteri, J. M., "Zu Zwinglis Elenchus", *Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschichte* XI, 1890, pp. 161 ff.

on the *Elenchus* (*Zwingli Werke* VI, pp. 65, 69-71), of which the author kindly permitted me to use the printer's proofs.[23]

Zwingli's statements relating to the author give definite points of reference for the solution to the problem. The author is Swiss;[24] he is dead (p. 65, 80), he is in fact in hell (p. 69), he was a participant in the first two "Tuesday conferences" with the Anabaptists in the autumn of 1524 in Zurich (p. 70), and he had promised Zwingli that all would be well if he would only join the Brethren.[25] On the basis of Zwingli's statements Hubmaier is excluded, for in the autumn of 1524 he was not in Zurich at all. Only Conrad Grebel and Felix Manz can be considered as authors and both of them fulfil the requirements completely.

But such a conclusion does not settle the question of authorship for this only establishes whom Zwingli supposed to be the author. The question still remains whether Zwingli's supposition was correct and also whether it is possible to decide between Grebel and Manz. From the content of the booklet itself no evidence can be adduced against the authorship of either Grebel or Manz. Both had earlier indicated an intention to write. Manz did so only once on March 6, 1526, in prison, when he said, "You will and must learn that infant baptism is not the baptism of Christ. You have not permitted me to write, because I have been in prison, although I have frequently requested it."[26] Grebel referred at least five times to his intention to write, the last time on March 5, 1526 in prison.[27] In

23. The analysis beyond note 28 is my own, not Blanke's.

24. *Elenchus*, p. 69: "Quamvis maximo argumento est lingua Helvetica, qua sic est scripta, ut externum aut peregrinum verbum nullum habeat." Further citations are indicated in the body of the text by page numbers of the *Elenchus* original given in parentheses.

25. Schuler und Schulthess, *op. cit.* III, p. 387.

26. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, March 5, 1526, pp. 442f. Egli is incomplete. Cited from Correll's copy. Manz spoke one other time of writing. Egli, No. 692, pp. 308ff: "Felix Mantz gitt sin antwurt also, von wegen des kindertouffs, er habe vormals dick begert, das Zwingli sine grund inn geschrifft stalte. Das sige nun beschehenn. Nun wenn man inn darumb erforder, darüber zu antwurtenn, wölle er sine grund ouch inn geschrifft stellenn und dann eine gantze gmeind darumb lassen urteilenn und das jederman by sinen worten und gschrifften belibe." Cited after Correll's copy, since Egli is incomplete.

27. Egli, *Aktensammlung*, March 5, 1526, No. 933, pp. 442ff. Egli incomplete, cited after Correll's copy. Grebel mentions his intention to write about baptism for the first time expressly in the letter to Müntzer, Sept. 5, 1524: "Ob du oder Carolostadius nit gnugsam wider den kindertouff schriben werdend . . . so wirde ich min heil versuchen (Cunrat Grebel) und dass ich angehebt han follen uss schriben wider alle, so biss har (on dich) von dem touff verführlich und wüssenlich schribend" (Boehmer- Kirn, *op. cit.*, p. 98). In his letter to Vadian of May 30, 1525, he says: "testimonium dabo . . . scripto libello, nisi Deus vetet." On the following August 9, 1525, (Egli, *Aktensammlung*, No. 797, p. 379) it is still clearer: "Witer hab och Kurat Grebel gret, wenn

testimony before court on that date this report appears: "Conrad Grebel's answer . . . He would like to show that Zwingli is in error in such (*sc.* infant baptism) and many other things, and requests my lords to permit him to write like Zwingli, in which case he would be able to prove his position. In case it should not appear then that he was successful in doing so he would be ready to suffer whatever the Lord should appoint."

Arguments which might be adduced in favor of either Grebel or Manz are not very strong. Both were probably present at the first Zurich disputation in January, 1523 and both heard Zwingli's invective against Faber at that time.[28] Very likely both appealed to Zwingli to join their group. The "sophist" from Wittenberg, whose indefensible arguments for infant baptism are mentioned by the author, was probably Erhard Hegenwalt, who had written "several arguments concerning infant baptism" to Myconius at the end of 1524, as he reported in his letter to Conrad Grebel of January 1, 1525;[29] but both Manz and Grebel could have read the "arguments." The accusation against Zwingli that he did not have the courage to confess the truth because of fear of persecution[30] sounds very much like the accusation which Grebel made against Vadian in similar circumstances;[31] nevertheless such an accusation is nothing specifically Grebelian. I cast my vote for Grebel primarily on the grounds that he was the one among the brethren who did the writing on other occasions. Manz never wrote anything, and Grebel had already planned in 1524 to publish a writing against Zwingli. The content of the pamphlet is too meagre to permit any significant comparison with the other writings of Grebel so that no help can be gotten from this source.

The date of the booklet may be fixed as the spring of 1526 by two arguments. (1) The terminus a quo is November 5, 1525, the date of the publication of Zwingli's *Antwort uber Balthasar Hub-*

---

man sin schriben liesy in truck usgan so wette er dann mit Meister Ulrich Zwingly disputieren." The other passages quoted, Grebel to Vadian, Sept. 3, 1525 and Jan. 14, 1525, are not quite so clear, but point to his intention to write.

28. *Elenchus*, p. 55. In the translation of the accusation of the Anabaptists referring to Zwingli's attitude toward the Vicar Faber, Zwingli uses the word "exclamavit". According to this the author heard Zwingli's statement at the first disputation in January, 1523. The minutes of the disputation, *Zwingli Werke*, I, 296, where Zwingli's expression is found, do not say that Zwingli "exclamavit".

29. Erhard Hegenwalt to Grebel, Jan. 11, 1525. Ms. in St. Gallen, Bibliotheca Vadiana.

30. Schuler und Schulthess, *op. cit.* p. 387.

31. Grebel to Vadian, March 30, 1525, *Vad. BrS.* III pp. 116-117.

*maiers Taufbuchlein,* for the author refutes an argument found in this book and goes to considerable length to denounce the principle of "Synecdoche" which Zwingli used in it.[32] (2) The booklet cannot have appeared very late in 1526 for Zwingli says that it has already been circulated for a considerable time (*multo iam tempore*) among the Brethren.[33] On the other hand it cannot have appeared before March 21, 1526, for the presumptive author, whether Grebel or Manz, was in prison in Zurich from October 8, 1525 to March 21, 1526. I would therefore suggest a date in the spring of 1526, not before April, as the most probable date of publication. As title of the booklet I have proposed *Booklet on Baptism* (*Taufbüchlein*), because it deals exclusively with the question of baptism.

The theme of the booklet is very limited. It consists exclusively of a refutation of two arguments in favor of infant baptism which Zwingli used in his writing, *Wer Ursach gebe zu Aufruhr,* which was written in December, 1524. Grebel, whom we shall consider as the author, begins by giving the first argument of Zwingli in literal citation.[34] Then he follows with a refutation in twelve numbered points. The argument by Zwingli is one of the most common arguments in favor of infant baptism. It runs as follows: The apostles baptised entire families and it is to be presumed that these families were not childless, therefore, the apostles baptised children. Zwingli refers to three cases, the household of Stephanas, Lydia and her household, and the household of another unnamed person. Grebel's refutation falls into two parts, of which the first has four sub-divisions. (1) Zwingli really dare not use this argument, because he once said that what the apostles did or did not do is not regulative for us and here he professes to use Paul's conduct as a proof for infant baptism (points 1 and 2). (2) In all the families which are described in the Acts or in the epistles, not any children are referred to (points 3 and 4). (3) Human "cogitation" and rationalization dare not be determinative here, for one can construe the families with or without children; what is needed is a positive proof from the Scripture for infant baptism, and Zwingli cannot produce that. Zwingli should not depart from the principle which he announced to Faber, "away with human ceremonies and

32. *Elenchus,* pp. 80, 81. The original quotation is to be found in *Zwingli Werke* IV, p. 361.

33. *Elenchus,* p. 31.

34. Grebel's quotation is to be found in *Zwingli Werke* III, pp. 410, 411.

regulations, we want only the Word of God" (points 5 to 7). (4) The family of Stephanas as well as all the other families which were baptised by the apostles, had all first heard the Word of God, for they served the church afterward. That would have been impossible for children (points 8 to 11).

The second argument which Zwingli used, namely that of "synecdoche," is to be rejected, as Grebel proves by several examples, as for instance that the church in Jerusalem had all "things" in common, in which "things" Zwingli includes the children in the church. Luke says that John baptised men and women in Samaria, therefore no children (point 12). The author's argument against "synecdoche" continues further, reports Zwingli, but Zwingli has sufficiently refuted it, and he will therefore not make any further quotations. Zwingli will undertake to refute at length in the third part of his book the argument of the author against the "testament" or "covenant."[35] Apparently in this argument Grebel dealt only very briefly with Zwingli's defense of infant baptism as based upon the covenant, and did so primarily as an illustration of false and unreliable "synecdoche." Zwingli's reply on this point in the third part of his book is not directed against quotations from Grebel's booklet, but is couched in general terms.

On the whole one is justified in saying that Grebel succeeded in refuting Zwingli's argument rather satisfactorily, although the argument itself is rather weak in character. Zwingli's refutation, on the contrary, in which he seeks to refute Grebel's arguments step by step, is for the most part rather futile. He often deviates from the fundamental theme, and takes occasion to make numerous evil accusations against the Anabaptists from various sources, arguments which have no connection at all with the text of Grebel's booklet. The worst spot comes in connection with the discussion of the passage in Acts 2:44. Zwingli had originally interpreted this passage in his first book, which Grebel was attacking, to include the children in the church. Grebel on the contrary places the children among the "things," which the church had in common. Grebel's argument is rather weak, it is true, but both Grebel and Zwingli are wrong in their interpretation, for certainly the author of Acts did not mean to include children at all. But Zwingli seizes

35. Schuler und Schulthess, *op. cit.*, III, p. 387. In the third part Zwingli attempts to prove from the idea of the covenant that the apostles baptized the children of believers.

upon Grebel's weakness and makes it the occasion for a slanderous attack on the Anabaptists. The product is without doubt the worst invective against the Anabaptists which appeared in the contemporary literature of the time. Zwingli condemns the Anabaptists as inhuman because they put children on the level of inanimate "things," which places them below the animals. Then he continues to charge the brethren with communism, with vice, with brutality, and with similar things. And so Grebel's little booklet on baptism unintentionally gave occasion to a libel which has wrought untold harm to the Anabaptist movement throughout the centuries since that time.

# ATTENDANCE AT MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936–1937

Silas Hertzler

Herewith are presented, for the ninth year, attendance statistics for the Mennonite schools and colleges of the United States and Canada. The writer has attempted to gather data for the smaller Bible schools and academies, as well as for the regularly organized colleges and secondary schools. However, some of these smaller schools are very irregularly conducted, and are organized in a most unstable fashion. For this reason and also because of the difficulty of securing adequate and prompt replies the smaller schools will be omitted from future reports. These data cover the school year 1936-1937, and include the summer of 1936.

Information was secured largely from a questionnaire sent to each institution which had previously responded. Other schools were included as far as names and addresses could be obtained. Catalogues were used for supplementary information where such were available. In addition, this year statistics for a few schools which did not send the necessary information were taken from *Who's Who Among the Mennonites,* 1937, pp. 178-180.

Thirty-three schools and Colleges are included in this year's report. Of this number twenty-five had reported for previous studies. Eight have not previously been included. Names and addresses of the schools included this year are as follows:

Bethel College, Bethel College [Newton], Kansas.
Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.
Bluffton College, Bluffton, Ohio.
Eastern Mennonite School, Harrisonburg, Virginia.
Hesston College and Bible School, Hesston, Kansas.
Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas.
Freeman Junior College, Freeman, South Dakota.
German-English Academy, Rosthern, Saskatchewan.
Mennonite Collegiate Institute, Gretna, Manitoba.
Ontario Mennonite Bible School, Kitchener, Ontario.
Bethany Bible School, Hepburn, Saskatchewan.
Corn Bible School, Corn, Oklahoma.
Pniel Bible School, Winkler, Manitoba.
Oklahoma Bible Academy, Meno, Oklahoma.

Herbert Bible School, Herbert, Saskatchewan.
Tabor Bible School, Dalmeny, Saskatchewan.
Mennonite Bible School, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
Henderson Bible School, Henderson, Nebraska.
Talitha Bible School, Yarrow, British Columbia.
Swift Current Mennonite Bible School, Swift Current, Saskatchewan.
Dallas Bible School, Dallas, Oregon.
Lustre Bible School, Frazer, Montana.
Morgenstern Bible School, Coaldale, Alberta.
Bethesda Bible School, Henderson, Nebraska.
Zoar Academy and Bible School, Inman, Kansas.
Mountain Lake Bible School, Mountain Lake, Minnesota.
Aufwaerts Bible School, Rosemary, Alberta.
Rosthern Bible School, Rosthern, Saskatchewan.
Waterloo Bible School, Waterloo, Ontario.
Beatrice Bible School, Beatrice, Nebraska.
Reedley Bible School, Reedley, California.
Horeb Bible School, Kitchener, Ontario.
Winnipeg German Bible School, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Table I gives the totals for attendance in all the schools from which the needed information could be secured. These schools are arranged in the order of gross attendance. The range is from 11 to 427. This is a grand total of 288 more than was included in the report at any previous time. Subtracting the attendance of 196 in the eight institutions not previously reporting, there is still a slight increase of 92 over the report for the previous year, which had been the highest up to that date. The footnotes give what information is necessary concerning the interpretation of irregularities in attendance.

It should be noted that the Winnipeg Bible School is an evening school. Several others are conducted for short terms only, ranging from three to six months per year. A few schools have greatly increased their reported attendance by including in their total, correspondence students, irregular music students, and students who attended six weeks Bible terms during the winter months.

Tables II and III separate the totals into a detailed tabulation representing college attendance and attendance of students of high school grade, or below. As in previous years this is done by classes. Table XII indicates that the college enrollment of 1242 is 91 larger than last year, and 8 larger than in 1930-1931, which represented the highest previous college enrollment. Comparisons indicate too, that the enrollment of 1894 in Table III is an increase of 187 over

1935-1936. This represents almost exactly the attendance at the additional institutions which reported this year.

The total number of Mennonite students has increased rather markedly. This year a record of 2,640 is an increase of 366 over the previous year. Eleven Mennonite groups are represented in the different institutions. The particular branch of Mennonites was not indicated in the case of 232 students in eleven schools.

Twenty-nine religious groups are included among the 496 non-Mennonite students. Forty students were members of no Christian church. Statistics were not given for thirty-five others.

Tables VI and VII give the home states, provinces, and countries of the 3,136 students reported. Mennonite students come from twenty-eight states, from five Canadian provinces, as well as from India and China. Kansas leads once more with a total of 516 students in seven institutions. Non-Mennonite students come from nineteen states and from three of the Canadian provinces.

Statistics were not quite complete for tables VIII and IX. As accurately as could be determined there were 822 Mennonite students of college grade, and 1,818 Mennonite students not of college grade. Only three of the schools hold a summer session. The range in attendance is from 51 to 91. Table XII gives the comparative summaries for each year since 1928.

## Table I

TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936-1937

| Schools | College | Academy | Bible | Other Departments | Total Enrollment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goshen College | 357 | ..... | 70[2] | ..... | 427 |
| Bethel College | 405 | ..... | ..... | 3[1] | 408 |
| Eastern Mennonite School | 38 | 105 | 141[3] | 75[4] | 359 |
| Bluffton College | 239 | ..... | ..... | 43[1] | 282 |
| Hesston College | 39 | 102 | 106 | 22[5] | 269 |
| Tabor College | 107 | 66 | 17[8] | ..... | 190 |
| Ontario Bible School | ..... | ..... | 172 | ..... | 172 |
| Freeman Junior College | 41 | 104 | ..... | 3[1] | 148 |
| German English Academy | ..... | 61 | 15 | ..... | 76 |
| Bethany Bible School | ..... | 72 | ..... | ..... | 72 |
| Corn Bible Academy | ..... | 71 | ..... | ..... | 71 |
| The Pniel Bible School | ..... | ..... | 61[10] | ..... | 61[6] |
| Mennonite Collegiate Institute | 16 | 37 | ..... | ..... | 53 |
| Oklahoma Bible Academy | ..... | 47 | 6 | ..... | 53 |
| Herbert Bible School | ..... | 49 | ..... | ..... | 49 |
| Tabor Bible School (Dalmeny) | ..... | 46 | ..... | ..... | 46 |
| The Winnipeg Bible School | ..... | ..... | 43 | ..... | 43[13] |
| The Mennonite Bible School | ..... | ..... | 38[10] | ..... | 38[6] |
| Henderson Bible School | ..... | 35 | ..... | ..... | 35 |
| Talitha Bible School | ..... | ..... | 30[11] | ..... | 30[6] |
| Swift Current Men. B. School | ..... | ..... | 29[10] | ..... | 29[6] |
| The Dallas Bible School | ..... | ..... | 27[11] | ..... | 27[6] |
| Lustre Bible School | ..... | 26[12] | ..... | ..... | 26 |
| Morgenstern Bible School | ..... | 24[12] | ..... | ..... | 24 |
| Bethesda Bible School | ..... | 22[12] | ..... | ..... | 22[6] |
| Zoar Acad. and B. School | ..... | 22 | ..... | ..... | 22 |
| Mountain Lake Bible School | ..... | 20 | ..... | ..... | 20 |
| Aufwaerts Bible School | ..... | ..... | 20[10] | ..... | 20 |
| Rosthern Bible School | ..... | ..... | 14[10] | ..... | 14 |
| Waterloo Bible School | ..... | 14 | ..... | ..... | 14 |
| Beatrice Bible School | ..... | 13 | ..... | ..... | 13 |
| Reedley Bible School | ..... | 12 | ..... | ..... | 12 |
| Horeb Bible School | ..... | ..... | 11 | ..... | 11 |
| Total | 1242 | 948 | 800 | 146 | 3136 |

[1] Music and art students not of college grade.
[2] Bible students for six weeks only.
[3] This total includes 111 Bible students who attended for six weeks only.
[4] Bible Correspondence school.
[5] Correspondence students not of college grade.
[6] *Who's Who Among the Mennonites*, 1937, pp. 178-180.
[7] Includes 94 students who attended for six weeks only.
[8] Bible and Music students in addition to the academy and college enrollment.
[9] The school term is twelve weeks only.
[10] School term of five months.
[11] School term of four months.
[12] School term of six months.
[13] An evening school only.

## Table II

### Enrollment by Classes, College Students, 1936–1937

| College | Seniors | Juniors | Sophomores | Freshmen | Special | Summer | Other Depts. | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bethel | 47 | 45 | 89 | 136 | 31 | 57[1] | .... | 405 |
| Goshen | 34 | 28 | 73 | 127 | 38[3] | 52[1] | 5[2] | 357 |
| Bluffton | 28 | 35 | 59 | 73 | 17 | 27[1] | .... | 239 |
| Tabor | 3 | .... | 33 | 55 | 16[3] | .... | .... | 107 |
| Freeman | .... | .... | 5 | 36 | .... | .... | .... | 41 |
| Hesston | .... | 1 | 12 | 26 | .... | .... | .... | 39 |
| E. M. S. | .... | .... | 13 | 23 | 2[3] | .... | .... | 38 |
| M. C. I. | .... | .... | .... | 16 | .... | .... | .... | 16 |
| Total | 112 | 109 | 284 | 492 | 104 | 136 | 5 | 1242 |

[1] Not counting duplicates. [2] Post graduate students.
[3] Unclassified and part time students.

## Table III

### Enrollment by Classes, Students not of College Grade, 1936–1937

| School | Seniors | Juniors | Sophomores | Freshmen | Unclassified | Bible | Other Depts. | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E. M. S. | 25 | 33 | 26 | 18 | 3 | 141[1] | 75[2] | 321 |
| Hesston | 33 | 19 | 19 | 31 | .... | 106[7] | 22 | 230 |
| Ontario | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 172 | .... | 172 |
| Freeman | 21 | 25 | 34 | 24 | .... | .... | 3[3] | 107 |
| Tabor | 20 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 3 | 17[2] | .... | 83 |
| Ger. Eng. Acad. | 22 | 14 | 10 | 15 | .... | 15 | .... | 76 |
| Bethany | .... | .... | 21 | 49 | 2 | .... | .... | 72 |
| Corn | 3 | 22 | 26 | 20 | .... | .... | .... | 71 |
| Goshen | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 70 | .... | 70 |
| Pniel | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 61 | .... | 61 |
| M. C. I. | .... | 14 | 12 | 11 | .... | .... | .... | 37 |
| Oklahoma | 9 | 12 | 9 | 17 | .... | 6 | .... | 53 |
| Herbert | .... | 10 | 10 | 29 | .... | .... | .... | 49 |
| Dalmeny | .... | 8 | 12 | 26 | .... | .... | .... | 46 |
| Bluffton | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 43[3] | 43 |
| Winnipeg | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 43[8] | .... | 43 |
| Menn. Bible Sch. | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 38 | .... | 38 |
| Henderson | .... | 4 | 12 | 19 | .... | .... | .... | 35 |
| Talitha | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 30 | .... | 30 |
| Swift Current | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 29 | .... | 29 |
| Dallas | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 27 | .... | 27 |
| Lustre | .... | .... | 9 | 14 | 3 | .... | .... | 26 |
| Morgenstern | .... | .... | .... | .... | 24 | .... | .... | 24 |
| Bethesda | .... | .... | 12 | 10 | .... | .... | .... | 22 |
| Zoar | .... | .... | .... | .... | 22 | .... | .... | 22 |
| Aufwaerts | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 20 | .... | 20 |
| Mountain Lake | .... | .... | .... | .... | 20 | .... | .... | 20 |
| Rosthern | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 14 | .... | 14 |
| Waterloo | .... | .... | .... | .... | 14 | .... | .... | 14 |
| Beatrice | .... | .... | .... | .... | 13 | .... | .... | 13 |
| Reedley | .... | .... | 7 | 5 | .... | .... | .... | 12 |
| Horeb | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 11 | .... | 11 |
| Bethel | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 133 | 175 | 235 | 301 | 104 | 800 | 146 | 1894 |

[1] Including 111 students who attended six weeks Bible term. [2] Bible students.
[3] Music and art students not of college grade. [4] Correspondence students.
[5] Bible students not counting duplicates. [6] School is now closed.
[7] Includes 94 Bible term students who attended for six weeks only.
[8] Evening students.

## Table IV

### Mennonite Students in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1936–1937

| Denomination | E. M. S. | Goshen | Bethel | Hesston | Ontario | Tabor | Freeman | Bluffton | Ger. Eng. | Bethany | Corn | Pniel | Oklahoma | M. C. I. | Dalmeny | Herbert | Winnipeg |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "Old" Mennonites | 352[1] | 302 | 2 | 229 | 163 | .... | .... | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| General Conference | .... | 3 | 255 | 17 | .... | 12 | 74 | 83 | 67 | 5 | 4 | .... | 53 | 38 | 7 | 10 | .... |
| Mennonite Brethren | .... | .... | 9 | 2 | .... | 117 | 6 | .... | 8 | 62 | 64 | .... | .... | 10 | 18 | 35 | 43 |
| Mennonite Unclassified | .... | .... | 6 | 2 | 1 | .... | 14 | 2 | .... | .... | .... | 61[2] | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Evangelical Menn. Brethren | .... | .... | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 21 | .... | .... |
| Krimmer Menn. Brethren | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | 24 | 17 | .... | .... | 5 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Central Conference | .... | 15 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 14 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Defenseless Mennonites | .... | .... | 1 | 2 | .... | .... | 8 | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Amish Mennonites | 5 | 3 | .... | .... | 8 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Menn. Brethren in Christ | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Kleinegemeinde | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... |
| Sommerfelder | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... |
| Total | 357 | 329 | 278 | 252 | 172 | 153 | 120 | 109 | 75 | 72 | 69 | 61 | 53 | 51 | 46 | 45 | 43 |

Table IV—Continued

| Denomination | Menn. Bible | Henderson | Talitha | Swift Current | Dallas | Lustre | Bethesda | Morgenst'n | Zoar | Aufwaerts | Mt. Lake | Rosthern | Waterloo | Beatrice | Reedley | Horeb | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| "Old" Mennonites | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1052 |
| General Conference | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | 6 | 22 | .... | .... | 19 | 2 | 14 | 14 | 13 | .... | 1 | 725 |
| Mennonite Brethren | .... | 11 | .... | .... | .... | 9 | .... | 22 | .... | 1 | 15 | .... | .... | .... | 7 | 10 | 449 |
| Mennonite Unclassified | 38[2] | .... | 30[2] | 29[2] | 27[2] | .... | .... | .... | 22[2] | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 232 |
| Evangelical Menn. Brethren | .... | 18 | .... | .... | .... | 11 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 57 |
| Krimmer Menn. Brethren | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 5 | .... | 53 |
| Central Conference | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 29 |
| Defenseless Mennonites | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 17 |
| Amish Mennonites | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 16 |
| Menn. Brethren in Christ | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 7 |
| Kleinegemeinde | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Sommerfelder | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Total | 38 | 35 | 30 | 29 | 27 | 26 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 2640 |

[1] Assuming that winter Bible term and correspondence students are all Mennonites.
[2] Statistics taken from A. Warkentin, *Who's Who Among the Mennonites,* pp. 179-180.

## Table V

### Non-Mennonite Students in Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1936–1937

| Denomination | Bluffton | Bethel | Goshen | Tabor | Freeman | Hesston | Herbert | E. M. S. | Corn | M. C. I. | Morgenstern | German English | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lutheran | 41 | 7 | 12 | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 66 |
| Methodist Episcopal | .... | 44 | 16 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 60 |
| Presbyterian | 24 | 10 | 7 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | 42 |
| Evangelical | 4 | 13 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 4 | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | 40 |
| Non-Church Members | .... | 11 | 5 | 20 | .... | .... | 2 | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 40 |
| Not Indicated | 10 | 2 | .... | 4 | 15 | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 35 |
| Reformed | 32 | .... | 1 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 34 |
| Brethren | .... | 1 | 26 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 27 |
| Baptist | 3 | 4 | 6 | 5 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | 1 | .... | 2 | .... | 22 |
| Roman Catholic | 13 | 3 | 1 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | 19 |
| Christian | .... | 14 | 2 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 17 |
| United Brethren | 14 | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 17 |
| Congregational | 5 | 8 | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 15 |
| Church of Christ | 8 | 2 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 11 |
| Episcopalian | 1 | 4 | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 9 |
| Methodist Protestant | .... | .... | 1 | .... | 1 | 7 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 9 |
| Interdenominational | 7 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 7 |
| Chr. Miss. Alliance | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 6 |
| Church of God | 1 | .... | .... | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 |
| Nazarene | .... | 2 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 3 |
| Friends | 1 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Pentecostal | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Christian Union | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Colored Methodist | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Congregational Christian | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Disciples of Christ | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Gospel Mission | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Hebrew | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | 1 |
| New Jerusalem | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Seventh Day Adventist | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Universalist | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Total | 173 | 130 | 98 | 37 | 28 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 496 |

Table VI

STATES, PROVINCES, AND COUNTRIES FROM WHICH MENNONITE STUDENTS COME, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936–37

| States | E. M. S. | Goshen | Bethel | Hesston | Ontario | Tabor | Freeman | Bluffton | German English | Bethany | Corn | Pniel | Oklahoma | M. C. I. | Dalmeny | Herbert | Winnipeg |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kansas | .... | 8 | 218 | 144 | .... | 110 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Saskatchewan | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | 3 | .... | .... | 751 | 63 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 46 | 37 | 2 |
| Pennsylvania | 211 | 21 | .... | 1 | 7 | .... | .... | 12 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Ohio | 23 | 96 | 1 | 1 | 14 | .... | .... | 76 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Manitoba | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 61 | .... | 49 | .... | .... | 41 |
| Oklahoma | .... | .... | 16 | 5 | .... | 23 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 66 | .... | 46 | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Ontario | 4 | 3 | .... | 2 | 114 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... |
| Indiana | 1 | 127 | 3 | .... | 6 | .... | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| S. Dakota | .... | .... | 7 | .... | .... | .... | 119 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Nebraska | .... | .... | 15 | 11 | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Virginia | 83 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Oregon | .... | 5 | 2 | 19 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Alberta | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 8 | .... |
| Illinois | .... | 33 | .... | 7 | .... | .... | .... | 11 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Michigan | 5 | 5 | .... | 5 | 19 | 1 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Iowa | .... | 7 | .... | 21 | 5 | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Minnesota | .... | .... | 7 | 3 | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Montana | .... | .... | 1 | 2 | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| British Columbia | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| California | .... | .... | 5 | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Maryland | 14 | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Missouri | 1 | 5 | .... | 8 | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| New York | 6 | 4 | .... | .... | 5 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Idaho | .... | 1 | 2 | 9 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Colorado | .... | 1 | 1 | 7 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| N. Dakota | .... | 3 | .... | 3 | .... | 1 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Texas | .... | 4 | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Delaware | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| India | 1 | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Tennessee | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Arizona | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Florida | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| West Virginia | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| China | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Mississippi | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Wisconsin | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... |
| Total | 357 | 329 | 278 | 252 | 172 | 153 | 120 | 109 | 75 | 72 | 69 | 61 | 53 | 51 | 46 | 45 | 43 |

[1] Assumed that all Mennonite Students were from Saskatchewan.

Table VI—Continued

| States | Menn. Bible School | Henderson | Talitha | Swift Current | Dallas | Lustre | Bethesda | Morgenst'n | Zoar | Aufwaerts | Mt. Lake | Rosthern | Waterloo | Beatrice | Reedley | Horeb | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kansas | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 22 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 506 |
| Saskatchewan | .... | .... | .... | 29[1] | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | 2 | .... | 14 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 275 |
| Pennsylvania | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 252 |
| Ohio | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 211 |
| Manitoba | 38 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 192 |
| Oklahoma | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 156 |
| Ontario | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 14 | .... | .... | 11 | 150 |
| Indiana | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 143 |
| S. Dakota | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 126 |
| Nebraska | .... | 32 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 22 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 13 | .... | .... | 101 |
| Virginia | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 84 |
| Oregon | .... | .... | .... | .... | 27 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 53 |
| Alberta | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 19 | .... | 18 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 51 |
| Illinois | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 51 |
| Michigan | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 36 |
| Iowa | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 35 |
| Minnesota | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 20 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 33 |
| Montana | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 26 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 33 |
| British Col. | .... | .... | 30 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 30 |
| California | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 12 | .... | 19 |
| Maryland | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 16 |
| Missouri | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 15 |
| New York | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 15 |
| Idaho | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 12 |
| Colorado | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 9 |
| N. Dakota | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 8 |
| Texas | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 7 |
| Delaware | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 |
| India | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 |
| Tennessee | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 |
| Arizona | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Florida | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| West Virginia | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| China | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Mississippi | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Wisconsin | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Total | 38 | 35 | 30 | 29 | 27 | 26 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 11 | 2640 |

## Table VII

STATES, PROVINCES, AND COUNTRIES FROM WHICH NON-MENNONITE STUDENTS COME, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936–1937

| States | Bluffton | Bethel | Goshen | Tabor | Freeman | Hesston | Herbert | E. M. S. | Corn | M. C. I. | Morgenstern | German English | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kansas | .... | 125 | .... | 31 | .... | 16 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 172 |
| Ohio | 160 | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 162 |
| Indiana | .... | .... | 87 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 87 |
| South Dakota | .... | .... | .... | .... | 28 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 28 |
| Illinois | 2 | .... | 3 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 6 |
| Oklahoma | .... | 2 | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | 6 |
| Pennsylvania | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 6 |
| Saskatchewan | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | 5 |
| Michigan | 1 | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 |
| Manitoba | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | 3 |
| Alberta | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | 2 |
| Minnesota | 1 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| New York | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Texas | .... | .... | 1 | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Washington | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Arizona | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| California | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Colorado | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Florida | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Nebraska | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| New Jersey | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Virginia | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Total | 173 | 130 | 98 | 37 | 28 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 496 |

## Table VIII

MENNONITE STUDENTS OF COLLEGE GRADE, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936–1937

| School | Men | Women | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Bethel | 134 | 108 | 278[1] |
| Goshen | 124 | 136 | 260 |
| Bluffton | 37 | 34 | 93[2] |
| Tabor | 30 | 59 | 89 |
| Hesston | 17 | 22 | 39 |
| E. M. S. | 16 | 22 | 38 |
| Freeman | 14 | 11 | 25 |
| Total | 372 | 392 | 822 |

1 Includes 36 students of college grade for whom detailed statistics are not given.
2 Includes 22 students of college grade for whom detailed statistics are not given.

## Table IX

### Mennonite Students not of College Grade, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, 1936–1937

| School | Men | Women | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| E. M. S. | 116 | 203 | 319 |
| Hesston | 100 | 113 | 213 |
| Ontario | 79 | 93 | 172 |
| Freeman | 33 | 62 | 95 |
| German Eng. Acad. | .... | .... | 75[1] |
| Bethany | 37 | 35 | 72 |
| Corn | 28 | 41 | 69 |
| Goshen | 33 | 36 | 69 |
| Tabor | 20 | 44 | 64 |
| Pniel | .... | .... | 61[2] |
| Oklahoma | 22 | 31 | 53 |
| Menn. Collegiate I. | 41 | 10 | 51 |
| Dalmeny | 27 | 19 | 46 |
| Herbert | 23 | 22 | 45 |
| Winnipeg | 2 | 41 | 43 |
| Menn. Bible School | .... | .... | 38[2] |
| Henderson | .... | .... | 35[2] |
| Talitha | .... | .... | 30[2] |
| Swift Current | .... | .... | 29[2] |
| Dallas | .... | .... | 27[2] |
| Lustre | 9 | 17 | 26 |
| Bethesda | 14 | 8 | 22 |
| Morgenstern | 11 | 11 | 22 |
| Zoar | .... | .... | 22[2] |
| Aufwaerts | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Mt. Lake | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| Bluffton | 4 | 12 | 16 |
| Rosthern | .... | .... | 14[2] |
| Waterloo | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Beatrice | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| Reedley | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| Horeb | 1 | 10 | 11 |
| Total | 637 | 850 | 1818[3] |

[1] Detailed statistics not given.
[2] Detailed statistics not given. Assumed that all students are Mennonites.
[3] Detailed statistics not given for several schools hence the grand total is larger than the sum of the separate totals for men and for women.

## Table X

### Summer Session, 1936, Mennonite Schools and Colleges

| School | Men | Women | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Goshen | 35 | 56 | 91 |
| Bethel | 33 | 48 | 81 |
| Bluffton | 16 | 35 | 51[1] |
| Total | 84 | 139 | 223 |

[1] The Bluffton College Bulletin, April, 1937, p. 72.

## Table XI

TOTAL ATTENDANCE, MEN AND WOMEN, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1936–1937

| School | Men | Women | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Goshen | 202 | 225 | 427 |
| Bethel | 214 | 194 | 408 |
| E. M. S. | 133 | 226 | 359 |
| Bluffton | 139 | 143 | 282 |
| Hesston | 126 | 143 | 269 |
| Tabor | 68 | 122 | 190 |
| Ontario | 79 | 93 | 172 |
| Freeman | 60 | 88 | 148 |
| German Eng. Acad. | .... | .... | 76[1] |
| Bethany | 37 | 35 | 72 |
| Corn | 28 | 43 | 71 |
| Pniel | .... | .... | 61[1] |
| M. C. I. | 42 | 11 | 53 |
| Oklahoma | 22 | 31 | 53 |
| Herbert | 25 | 24 | 49 |
| Dalmeny | 27 | 19 | 46 |
| Winnipeg | 2 | 41 | 43 |
| Menn. Bible School | .... | .... | 38[1] |
| Henderson | .... | .... | 35[1] |
| Talitha | .... | .... | 30[1] |
| Swift Current | .... | .... | 29[1] |
| Dallas | .... | .... | 27[1] |
| Lustre | 9 | 17 | 26 |
| Morgenstern | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| Bethesda | 14 | 8 | 22 |
| Zoar | .... | .... | 22[1] |
| Mt. Lake | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| Aufwaerts | 10 | 10 | 20 |
| Rosthern | .... | .... | 14[1] |
| Waterloo | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| Beatrice | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| Reedley | 3 | 9 | 12 |
| Horeb | 1 | 10 | 11 |
| Total | 1277 | 1527 | 3136 |

[1] Detailed statistics not given.

## Table XII

TOTAL ATTENDANCE, MENNONITE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1928-1937

| Year | Total | Mennonite | College | Academy | Bible | Other Depts. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1928-29 | 1538 | 1025 | 847 | 569 | ..... | 122 |
| 1929-30 | 1967 | 1259 | 1085 | 609 | ..... | 273 |
| 1930-31 | 2180 | 1515 | 1234 | 710 | 110 | 126 |
| 1931-32 | 1928 | 1337 | 944 | 522 | 259 | 203 |
| 1932-33 | 1673 | 1135 | 906 | 416 | 277 | 74 |
| 1933-34 | 1735 | 1259 | 921 | 348 | 402 | 64 |
| 1934-35 | 2272 | 1742 | 1025 | 550 | 502 | 195 |
| 1935-36 | 2848 | 2274 | 1151 | 1050 | 470 | 177 |
| 1936-37 | 3136 | 2640 | 1242 | 948 | 800 | 146 |

## Table XIII

### Diplomas Given and Degrees Granted, Mennonite Schools and Colleges, June and August, 1936

| | Goshen | Bethany | Dalmeny | Herbert | Bluffton | Tabor | E. M. S. | Hesston | Freeman | Bethel | Lustre | Corn | Ontario | Henderson | Rosthern | Reedley | Horeb | Oklahoma | Mt. Lake | Beatrice | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B. A. | 24 | .... | .... | .... | 34 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 25 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 83 |
| B. S. in Education | 14 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 14 |
| B. S. in Home Economics | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| B. of School Music | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 4 |
| B. S. in Industrial Arts | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 |
| Th. B. | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 |
| Junior College | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 15 | 9 | 8 | 8 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 40 |
| Two Year Normal | 39 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 3 | .... | 6 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 48 |
| One Year Normal | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 16 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 16 |
| Adv. Bible (College) | 1 | .... | .... | .... | .... | 2 | 3 | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 10 |
| Academy | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 21 | 15 | 22 | .... | .... | .... | 3 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 6 | .... | .... | 67 |
| Bible Acad. (3 yrs.) | .... | .... | 4 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 22 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | 3 | .... | 30 |
| Bible Acad. (2 yrs.) | .... | .... | 20 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 1 | .... | 1 | 22 |
| Elem. Bible (3 yrs.) | .... | 9 | 27 | 9 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 3 | .... | .... | 4 | .... | 3 | 5 | .... | .... | .... | 60 |
| Elem. Bible (2 yrs.) | .... | 22 | .... | 10 | .... | .... | 7 | 2 | .... | .... | 9 | .... | 1 | 12 | 5 | 10 | 6 | .... | .... | .... | 84 |
| Elem. Bible (1 yr.) | .... | 35 | .... | 27 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 14 | .... | 23 | .... | 9 | .... | .... | .... | .... | .... | 108 |
| Total | 79 | 66 | 51 | 46 | 38 | 38 | 37 | 36 | 30 | 29 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 16 | 14 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 591 |